

1962

invasion prisoners. Seems to me that is not the duty of a private individual in our country, to negotiate with another country. Where are our elected officials? What deals, or concessions are being made?

Seems to me our President is taking every possible way to circumvent our legislative bodies on every issue in which he can't have his own way.

Best wishes to you in this fight.

Sincerely,

DEAR MR. CRAMER: Supporting and backing you regarding Dr. Donovan exchange of surplus food and medicines for Cuban prisoners. Have written to President Kennedy protesting this action by Dr. Donovan.

Sincerely,

SHIRLEY B. FOUTS.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.,
October 10, 1962.

Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Women's Republican Club of St. Petersburg, 1,970 members strong, back you to the limit in fight against private negotiations with Castro. Wires being sent to Dean Rusk and President Kennedy.

Mrs. JOHN T. SALMON.

OCTOBER 11, 1962.

Hon. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: It is obvious that Fidel Castro, Ernesto Guevara and their associates in the Cuban Government are so firmly imbued with Communist doctrine that nothing short of force can cause them to change their position.

This being so, it is useless to hope for any improvement in relations with that government. They will continue to employ every means within their power to further the cause of communism and to set back the cause of the free world.

If the Castro government is to be dislodged, force must be employed. The U.S. Government has committed itself to refrain from using force in this matter. Rulers of the member nations of the Organization of American States are not eager to accept the social reforms implicit in all-out opposition to communism since they feel their position is stable so long as they have the support of the military, hence their support of the use of concerted force against the Castro government will be nominal, at best. The Cuban exiles are the ones who have lost the most from actions of the Castro government and who stand to gain the most from the dislodgement of the Castro Communist regime. Being intimately concerned, they will fight the hardest to restore Cuba to the free world.

It is therefore respectfully suggested that a Cuban government-in-exile be recognized as the logical and most effective means for the elimination of the Castro Communist tyranny and the restoration of civil rights to the oppressed peoples of Cuba.

Respectfully,

ROBERT O. WILKINSON, B.S.

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I thoroughly approve of Congressman CRAMER's opposition to the Cuban negotiations. I have bitterly opposed them from the start.

Since when do you negotiate with the enemy?

Since when do Christians negotiate with the Devil?

Is Florida to be a second Pearl Harbor? It was your kind who created the first,

idiotic parties to raise money for the Kennedy gang; this is more important than protecting decent American citizens, isn't it?

How much do you care for our beloved men rotting in Red Chinese prisons? In North Korea too and even Russia's slave labor camps?

Donovan's wheeling and dealing is a vicious violation of the Logan Act, but perhaps you are like Fulbright, Schlesinger et al and think "the people are too dumb to know," Powers and Able should have stayed where they were. We are at war.

Why do you lie and claim this is a private deal when we know it is our own tax money the CIA will hand over?

PT-109 indeed:

"Know therefore that Jehovah thy God, He is God, the faithful God, who keepeth covenant and loving kindness with them that love Him and keep His Commandments to a thousand generations."

Hon. WILLIAM CRAMER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: A goodly number of us are grateful to you for your strong position against our Government's paying blood-money to Communist Castro for his unfortunate captives.

I entreat you to continue in your effort to prevent such weak and cowardly action with every resource at your command, assured that the American people are prepared to provide you with moral, intellectual and emotional support.

The lives of those freedom fighters are too precious to be paid for in gold, and the United States of America must not do business in any case with unprincipled barbarians.

Yours truly,

MARY B. SNYDER.

OCTOBER 9, 1962.

Mr. WILLIAM CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CRAMER: The writer wishes to congratulate you on the stand you have taken on sending a wire to our President to pick up the \$60 million tab. This is the taxpayers money and I, as one, do not see that our Government should give them (Commies) any food or drugs. What about our own boys in Russia and China that are suffering behind the Commies' curtains.

I think the American public should stand up and demand of our Government, who is paying this blackmail. At this time there is a lot of talk about the release of these prisoners, but there is nothing said about the \$60 million Castro demands for their release.

From my understanding of our Government this issue should be brought before our Congress.

Thanks for reading this.

Sincerely,

V. J. HENKE.

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. CRAMER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

TRI-CITY HARBOR, LAKE COUNTY,
IND.

(Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, during the last few weeks we have heard considerable remarks on the House floor regarding the Burns Ditch Harbor on the south shore of Lake Michigan in Indiana.

We have also heard from the gentleman from Indiana, Congressman RAY J. MADDEN, regarding the practical advantages of the construction of the Tri-City Port Harbor adjacent to Hammond, East Chicago, and Whiting, Ind., in Lake County. The following letter from Mr. R. J. Smith, chairman, Rivers and Harbors Committee of the Hammond Chamber of Commerce contributes some solid information regarding the advantages of a harbor location in an area where three steel mills are already operating and several hundred more small industries could take advantage of the new harbor construction.

I am extending my remarks to include the following letters from the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the Hammond Chamber of Commerce:

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

EDITORIAL PAGE EDITOR,
Gary Post Tribune,
Gary, Ind.

DEAR SIR: Your editorial of October 7 condemns the tricity port as a smokescreen attempt to defeat Burns Harbor and as impracticable. This is not only harsh but grossly inaccurate.

Professional opinion in behalf of the tricity port site is impressive. Prof. Harold Mayer, waterway and urban authority of the University of Chicago and author of an authoritative book on the St. Lawrence Seaway has endorsed this site as feasible. Morris N. Quade, consulting engineer and waterway expert of New York of the firm of Parsons, Brinkerhoff, Quade, and Douglas, has supported this Hammond, Whiting, East Chicago port in his professional capacity and as a member of a professional group that has made engineering studies of this site.

The proposed tricity harbor would be formed by connecting existing breakwaters at Indiana Harbor and at the Illinois-Indiana line with 4 miles of new breakwater. This would enclose a harbor area approximately 6 miles long and 2 miles wide which would allow 4,800 acres behind the breakwater for industrial and harbor development by fill methods. Engineering study shows that the 4,800 acres can be filled by low-cost methods that are economically compatible with its intended use.

The most important advantage of the tricity site is that it is the only site on any of the five Great Lakes that can act as a common terminal for the ocean vessels of the St. Lawrence Seaway and barges of the Mississippi-gulf barge system.

Congressman RAY MADDEN, of the Lake County congressional districts, the mayors of the four major cities of the county, the city councils of Hammond, Whiting, and East Chicago, the county commissioners of Lake County, Ind., major industries and labor unions in this county, including one of our largest steel mills and one of our largest unions, and the chambers of commerce of Hammond and East Chicago have all supported the tricity port study. This concerted effort led by Congressman MADDEN has been successful. Both House of the U.S. Congress have now passed an appropriation in the amount of \$50,000 for the first year of a 3-year feasibility study by the Corps of Army Engineers of the tricity site. A tricity harbor and industrial development has enormous significance for Lake County to restore high employment.

Many industries have left Lake County in recent years. Between 1957 and 1962 manu-

facturing jobs in Hammond alone have suffered a 20-percent reduction. Layoffs of Lake County steel workers reach 50 percent all too frequently. The Lake County steel district area is classified as a depressed area by the U.S. Bureau of Labor. Unemployment in Gary, Hammond, and East Chicago, is 7.3 percent, the highest for any of the seven major manufacturing districts in the State. By comparison, unemployment in the State is 4.8 percent; Indianapolis, 4.2 percent; and South Bend, 4.4 percent.

An economically depressed area in a county of 514,000 people is not only a local problem but a national one. Tricity port offers an unparalleled industrial opportunity for Lake County and the State of Indiana.

What does the proposed Burns Harbor offer to the Nation and the State? To the one steel mill now there (and no other steel mill has committed itself to building) the proposed Burns Harbor would be an outright subsidy and that steel mill would gain over 90 percent of the benefits. New and automated steel mills produce the same amount of steel with a fraction of the manpower. The manpower requirement per ton in an automated mill is estimated to be one-fourth that of an older mill. A new automated steel center at Burns Harbor made possible through a Federal grant of \$26 million and State revenue bond financing of \$38 million would further depress employment in the Lake County industrial area, Hammond through Gary.

The one steel company now located at Burns Ditch can build its own slips and docks as did the Gary mills. By so doing, its present commitment would be protected and it would not gain an unfair competitive advantage over other local steel mills.

The proponents of the tricity port rest their case on the merits of that location subject to confirmation by the now assured feasibility survey by the Army Engineers. This culminates an effort that goes back almost 50 years. A smokescreen doesn't have that kind of endurance, however diverting it may be as a rhetorical symbol.

R. J. SMITH.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON NARCOTIC AND DRUG ABUSE

Mr. LIBONATI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LIBONATI. The White House Conference on Narcotic and Drug Abuse has completed its conference—an official transcript of the Conference is not available at this time. Dr. Lois L. Higgins, because of her specialized practical knowledge at all levels of this ugly subject received an invitation from the President, John Kennedy, to attend and participate in the discussions. The President realizes that there is no greater human problem confronting our Nation. Medical authority, sociologists, police experts, penologists, psychiatrists, and welfare authorities have studied this subject in all of its phases. Judges of the courts and enforcement officers and prosecutors have discussed and debated the various theories on what are the best procedures to deal with the addicts, pushers, and pushers of dope. Hospitalization facilities and related curative methods have been tested and experimented over the years.

We hope that the Conference through its open discussion of the various phases of this problem will make further con-

tributions to control of narcotics both in the habit and suppression of the traffic. Ultimately a cure will be found—meantime the treatment of the victim as a diseased person or incarceration as a felon or law violator must be determined by Federal statutes. We are anxious to review the discussions and findings of the Conference in order as legislators to aid us in our determinations. We are proud of those in attendance at the Conference and applaud and praise their efforts in their dedication to solve this problem for the health and happiness of these unfortunates and the alleviation of the anxieties of their families. We are indebted to Dr. Lois Higgins' report and congratulate her in her great career herein.

REPORT ON THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON NARCOTIC AND DRUG ABUSE

(By Lois L. Higgins)

On May 29, 1962, the Honorable John F. Kennedy issued a statement announcing that a White House Conference on Narcotics would be held in late summer. He said:

"The problems arising out of the use of narcotics and other habit-forming drugs are many and varied including those of law enforcement, the treatment to be accorded addicts, posttreatment procedures and perhaps most importantly an accurate and up-to-date assessment of the particular nature and magnitude of addiction in the United States. It is our intention to bring to the Conference national authorities and leaders, including those in Federal, State, and local governments, to better understand the facets of addiction and to formulate a course of action designed to cope more effectively with this national problem area."

"The Attorney General will serve as General Chairman of the Conference. I have discussed this proposal with Governor Brown, of California, and Mayor Wagner, of New York City, who represent two jurisdictions where drug addiction is especially prevalent and they agree that such a conference could be most helpful. Many other government officials including Members of the Congress from those two areas have also urged that a conference be held."

Invitations were received in mid-September and upon responding, delegates received preconference materials of general interest, along with delegate badges for admission to the State Department Auditorium where the 400 invitees were to meet. Registration began at 8:30 a.m. on the morning of September 27, 1962.

Television and radio communications had been set up in the auditorium and they continued throughout the 2-day meeting.

The press was well represented and it appeared that the talks were being translated into different languages—but this is merely a conjecture based on the operations in view. It is not confirmed.

The President of the United States was introduced by the Honorable Robert Kennedy, Chairman. He advised the 400 delegates that this Conference could be only window-dressing, or, it could produce concrete programs for action at Federal, State, and local levels. He said that there is "no area where there is so much of mystery, misunderstanding and difference of opinion" as in the field of narcotic addiction. He stressed the need for elimination of illicit drug traffic and the need for greater emphasis on treatment of addicts. While the traffic in illegal drugs seems to have been lessened in recent years, he noted that there is growing abuse, especially among young people in the use of so-called nonnarcotic barbiturates and pep pills. He remarked with feeling "Society's gain will be illusory

if we have reduced the incidence of one kind of drug addiction only to have new kinds of drugs substituted."

President Kennedy expressed hope that Congress would pass a bill he requested strengthening Federal powers to control manufacture and distribution of barbiturates and stimulant drugs.

He mentioned that he had just presented a special citation to Harry Anslinger, retired Commissioner of Narcotics (Treasury Department) for outstanding service in reducing illegal drug traffic. He noted that the American people are most indebted to him (Anslinger) for his 45 years of Federal service.

The President mentioned the discouragingly large number of relapses among addicts who leave our medical institutions (Lexington and Fort Worth) free of any physical dependence on drugs—and noted that this makes it clear that more must be done.

The loudspeaker was not working properly and it was difficult to hear the next few speakers. However, it can be noted that Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon, under whom the Narcotics Bureau (Federal) operates said that Treasury is concerned with the human and social aspects of addiction as well as stopping illegal traffic.

The new Secretary of HEW the Honorable Anthony J. Celebrezze told the delegates that "a program of civil commitment for addicts, coupled with a rehabilitative parole system would be an important forward step."

This statement reminded me that Attorney General Kennedy in opening the Conference stated "for all that is said, argued or believed about narcotics and drugs, the depressing truth is that we don't know very much about them. He referred to the working booklet 'Ad Hoc Panel' which delegates received prior to the Conference—noted that there is a very sharp drop in drug addiction after the age of 35 or 40, but that we can only guess at the reason." He went on "We can see that our job, therefore, is clear—it is to start finding out—to start building a reasonable and reliable body of information."

Governor Brown, of California, spoke of that State's fight against the problem and noted his own experience as former Attorney General. He said that California now has better laws and has been gaining in the fight since now there is the possibility of keeping parolees and probationers under supervision through the use of Nalline and the results of those tests. Governor Brown was an eloquent speaker and he could be heard by all. While great gains have been made there, he said, there is still a need for stricter laws and more adequate rehabilitation programs for addicts—in the local communities and at all levels. He also urged research.

Mayor Wagner addressed himself to the New York problem and stated that he too, favored strict penalties for peddlers and research into rehabilitation. He described the programs now in operation in New York City and expressed the hope that the Conference would be able to assist generally, in the entire area of narcotic and drug abuse problems.

In almost each speaker's text was reference to the new and growing problem of misuse of tranquilizers, barbiturates, pep pills, and other synthetic drugs. Statistics as to the increase in manufacture of these drugs was noted by almost every speaker.

Attached to this report is a copy of the entire program with speakers and subject matter information. It is impossible here to note the contribution of each, and it was indicated that the delegates will eventually receive copies of the texts.

With 1,200 miles of shoreline, with several ports of entry this poses a tremendous problem of keeping drugs out of country. He

1962

\$62 million in foodstuffs and medicine to Castro, public indignation over these negotiations by a private citizen, apparently committing the United States, and certainly under authority of the U.S. Government, has resulted in expressions from all over the country of indignation.

This appeasement is to be compared to strong language over Cuba used in the 1960 campaign, which I set out hereafter:

J.F.K.'s Big 1960 Promises About Cuba

In the light of developments of the past 20 months, there is a hollow sound to J.F.K.'s glowing promises about Cuba, made when he was seeking the Presidency in 1960. Why not write a "letter to the editor" using these quotations? Here are a few of them:

"I want people to wake up all over the world in the next years and wonder not what Mr. Khrushchev is doing or what Mr. Castro is doing. I want them to wonder what the United States is doing."—Candidate J.F.K., Queens, N.Y., October 27, 1960.

"Mr. Nixon hasn't mentioned Cuba very prominently in this campaign. He talks about standing firm in Berlin, standing firm in the Far East, standing up to Khrushchev, but he never mentions standing firm in Cuba—and if you can't stand up to Castro, how can you be expected to stand up to Khrushchev?"—Candidate J.F.K., Johnstown, Pa., October 15, 1960.

"We must let Mr. Castro know that we do not intend to be pushed around any longer and in particular do not intend to be pushed out of our naval base at Guantanamo or denied fair compensation for American property he has seized."—Candidate J.F.K., Johnstown, Pa., October 15, 1960.

"We must let Mr. Khrushchev know that we are permitting no expansion of his foothold in our hemisphere."—Candidate J.F.K., Johnstown, Pa., October 15, 1960.

"I am not satisfied to have the hand of the Communists more 3,000 miles from East Berlin to our former good neighbor in Cuba, only 90 miles from the coast of Florida, only 8 minutes by jet."—Candidate J.F.K., Washington, D.C., September 20, 1960.

"If communism should obtain a permanent foothold in Latin America then the balance of power would move against us and peace would be even more insecure."—Candidate J.F.K., New York City, September 14, 1960.

I include some examples of the expressions of indignation for the RECORD in the hope that the administration will withdraw its support of this effort, the only result of which can be the support of communism and Castro—consistent with 1960 promises:

JACKSONVILLE, FLA.,
October 11, 1962.

Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CRAMER: Congratulations on your stand and belief regarding the Cuban prisoner exchange deal. I consider this about the lowest possible thing that I know of for our President to sanction and encourage this blackmail and bribery. Thanking you for your stand and please keep fighting.

Z. V. ROSSER.

OCTOBER 11, 1962.

DEAR SIR: We agree with you in keeping the U.S. taxpayers money out of the Cuban ransom deal.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. GRAFTON COCHRAN, Jr.

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

DEAR BILL: Just to let you know we are backing you in your efforts against negotiations being performed by Donovan.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS A. and DOROTHY B. KIRK.

OCTOBER 11, 1962.

Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We concur with your estimate of the Cuban prisoner exchange deal; we think it does, too, in other words. To have arranged the exchange of Abel for Powers is a poor recommendation for New York Attorney James B. Donovan; it's downright suspicious, in fact. What about the Cuban children who have been shipped to Russia, Red China, and other Communist countries? Is anybody trying to effect their release?

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. H. M. THOMPSON.

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am backing you in your stand against negotiations being performed by Donovan, a private individual, trading with Cuba, an enemy country. This is contrary, I believe, to the Logan Act.

Sincerely,

HELEN M. BOSWORTH.

OCTOBER 11, 1962.

Hon. WILLIAM CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: What is all this talk about this James Donovan making deals with Castro for the prisoners held there? And who has authorized him to do so?

If I am not mistaken it was decided some time ago we would not be held up to pay ransom to that bearded butcher.

Has this matter of James Donovan making deals with Castro been discussed on Capitol Hill at this time—or is it none of the business of our Congressmen and Senators these days? Soon, at the rate we are going, we will not need our elected Members of Congress and Senators.

I would say the administration's leadership is talking out of both sides of their mouth and what is more in the act of blocking his country with one hand and handing him great quantities of food, medicine, and of all things money—taxpayers' money. How asinine.

Khrushchev will not have to bury us with such stupid leadership carrying out such deals. We are bankrupting our Nation and tearing it down morally with such lowbrow leadership these days.

With every good wish.

Very sincerely,

ELIZABETH DAVIS.

OCTOBER 11, 1962.

Hon. WILLIAM CRAMER,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. WILLIAM CRAMER: Have been reading about Donovan going to Cuba to offer food and drugs in exchange for the Cuban prisoners. Seems this would be a big help to the enemy who could so easily ship it to Russia, and the Cuban people would have no good of it. How mixed up can the State Department and others in Washington get?

We are certainly backing you in your stand against this, as well as other ways you are fighting communism.

Yours truly,

Mrs. MABEL KINSEY.

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

Hon. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CRAMER: We are backing you all the way regarding Donovan, a private individual, trading with Cuba. The Cuban situation is most alarming and we hope the most drastic measures possible will be taken to oust the Russians from our doorstep. It is better to risk and even have war now than later on when we are isolated.

Thank you for the fine job you always do as our Congressman.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT E. BAYLEY.

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CRAMER: I commend you highly on trying to bring out the hidden facts regarding the administration's role regarding its part in the release of Cuban prisoners. Food—medicine or money—what's the difference in blackmail? Let's keep America's image high—not lower it.

Very truly,

Mrs. RUSSELL G. LUDWIG.

REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
Florida.

DEAR SIR: I am in full accord with your demand for a congressional investigation that the U.S. Government may pay part of the ransom for Cuban invasion prisoners, if we pay this ransom or "blackmail" to the Castro government this Nation will have to hang its head in shame forever. There is too much double talking about what we will do, but never do, as President Kennedy said, no one should doubt our resolution in Laos, but the picture is that Laos has gone to the Communists. So let's begin to say a few things we mean and back our words with action if necessary in any way that will bring results.

Yours respectfully,

HARRY M. HOBROCK.

CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM CRAMER,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE CONGRESSMAN: We wholeheartedly agree with your views on the Cuban prisoner deal. We admire you for having the intestinal fortitude to fight this disgraceful blackmail. It does one's heart good to know that we have one who is not afraid to fight for the rights of "The American citizen." We pray that you will succeed in your fight and wish you success in doing so.

Respectfully,

Mr. and Mrs. HENRY J. PLATE.

OCTOBER 11, 1962.

Hon. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CRAMER: I have been reading with interest and concern about the proposed ransoming of the Bay of Pigs prisoners.

It would be a terrible mistake to give the enemy any succor. In the first place, people who feel strong enough about dictatorship and oppression to fight are the last to ask or approve any aid to the enemy. It is natural that relatives and loved ones, as well as our heart, ask that the prisoners be rescued but this is total war with communism.

Secondly, it doesn't make sense to give dollars and medicine with the right hand and then organize a blockade with the left.

Encourage the President to enforce a complete embargo on trade with Cuba but don't vote for or authorize one red cent, public or private, for Communist Castro's Cuba.

Respectfully offered,

FRED M. WHITAKER.

OCTOBER 11, 1962.

Hon. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SIR: May I extend my compliments upon your stand in connection with the Donovan deal.

I do not see how we can have a policy which asks the Greeks, the Swedes, the Norwegians and the British to withhold commerce from Cuba and, at the same time, even as ransom, permit the giving of more probably give (with taxpayer's money), \$62 million worth of food and drugs.

All reports in the press and elsewhere indicate that our South American neighbors have lost respect for our policy, due to our wavering on the Cuba situation. If this deal is permitted to go through, surely it cannot

October 13

help but further lower our prestige there, if, indeed, it has not sunk below any recognizable level.

Yours sincerely,

BLAKE MORE GODWIN.

Thank you Congressman CRAMER for probing the Donovan-King John infamy.

How do the people of Florida put up with this punk in the W.H.?

MARIE HANNON.

OCTOBER 11, 1962.

DEAR BILL: I am with you 100 percent on the Cuba situation.

The people of Florida and the Nation will certainly be shocked should this Government allow itself to be blackmailed into contributing 1 penny toward the release of prisoners who by now have become thoroughly brainwashed.

What is wrong with our Government, especially our State Department?

Sincerely,

C. B. O'NEAL.

HOMESTEAD, FLA., October 11, 1962.

Congressman WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Even though my grandfather would turn in his grave and I will also before I recognize Republicanism, please continue to hold the Democrats feet to the fire on the Donovan intervention.

HARRY R. KNIGHT.

GAINESVILLE, FLA.,
October 11, 1962.

Representative WILLIAM CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Millions for fish tanks, nothing for human lives.

E. M. SOLOMON.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,
October 12, 1962.

Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank God for your stand against Communist blackmail. Keep up the good fight against the appeasers who are selling out America and the Constitution.

JOHN MASSEY.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.,
October 10, 1962.

Hon. WILLIAM CRAMER,
Washington, D.C.:

Backing you to limit on your stand on Donovan exchange of prisoners.

FLORENCE M. CAMERON.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.,
October 10, 1962.

WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
Washington, D.C.:

I am backing you wholeheartedly on the Donovan issue.

Sincerely,

Mrs. C. G. BRIDGES.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.,
October 10, 1962.

Congressman WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Backing you 100 percent on stand on Donovan as private individual trading with Cuba.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. LEE JEAN WELLS.

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

Hon. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: My friends and neighbors and all the members of the Women's Republican Club of St. Petersburg, Fla., are

certainly backing you in the position you have taken regarding the super-secret negotiations being performed by James B. Donovan, a private citizen, in connection with the release of 1,118 invasion prisoners in Cuba—this contrary to the Logan Act. We admire your fighting spirit in this respect—keep it up.

Respectfully yours,

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The 1,113 Cubans would not now be prisoners if you had met your commitment to provide air cover at the Bay of Pigs.

Now you are trying to remedy one small part of the results of your error by buying the release of the 1,113. What are you doing to liberate the other 6 million Cubans?

I object to the expenditure of taxpayers' money to pay blackmail.

I object to expedients such as this which will further make a laughingstock of this country.

I object to continued appeasement surrounded by noble talk.

Effective action is needed: and if you do something effective, the whole country will support you.

Very truly yours,

JOHN T. SALMON.

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

The SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The 1,118 Cubans would not now be prisoners if you had met your commitment to provide air cover at the Bay of Pigs.

Now you are trying to remedy one small part of the results of your error by buying the release of the 1,118. What are you doing to liberate the other 6 million Cubans?

I object to the expenditure of taxpayers' money to pay blackmail.

I object to expedients such as this which will further make a laughingstock of this country.

I object to continued appeasement surrounded by noble talk.

Effective action is needed: and if you do something effective, the whole country will support you.

Very truly yours,

JOHN T. SALMON.

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

Hon. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We are backing you all the way in regard to the Donovan case—a private individual trading with Cuba.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. MARGARET T. BANTING.

OCTOBER 9, 1962.

Hon. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
Representative of the State of Florida,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CRAMER: With a full realization of time consumption of correspondence, I hesitate to write. However, there is a point that keeps coming to my mind, which is this: If our Congress is going to allow the Supreme Court (known sometimes as a school board) "to rewrite the Constitution to conform to the spirit of the times and to take into account sociological, if not ideological changes" (quote editorial—U.S. News & World Report, Oct. 1, 1962), I say again, if this is going to be, then also apply the spirit of times to the judges. The Supreme Court judges should be elected by the people. Again, I repeat, if they are going to write the laws (and be a school board), they should have to come before the people for election.

One other questions, Does our Congress of

the United States of America believe the 14th amendment changes the 10th amendment?

Stop Castro somehow.

It is with regret you will not be our Representative in 1963. We wish you well and keep plugging.

Very cordially yours,

J. E. BARBER.

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

Hon. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CRAMER: This is to advise you that my husband and I are against the negotiations being performed by James B. Donovan, a private individual trading with Cuba. We heartily approve of your stand in this matter. How can we expect cooperation of our allies by stopping trade with Cuba?

Good luck in your fight.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. WILLIAM E. FILES.

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

DEAR MR. CRAMER: I am backing you to the limit in your stand against the method being used for the release of the Cuban prisoners.

Sincerely,

MARY D. BROWN.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Your telegram to President Kennedy was a very apt and needful one in connection with the matter of ransoming the folks in Cuba. It is so strange why the administration goes about so many things in such half-cocked, blundering and ill-advised ways which, very obviously, will not pan out, or creates such bad impressions abroad and at home.

Respectfully,

OSCAR E. LANCASTER.

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CRAMER: My husband and I are backing you 100 percent in your opposition to the secretly arranged exchange (by Donovan) of surplus food and medicine for Cuban prisoners.

Sincerely,

Dr. and Mrs. R. B. LUTH.

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

Mr. CRAMER: Thank you for your courageous and forthright stand against this most recent "deal". I am constantly reminded of the old Americanism "Millions for Defense But Not One Cent for Tribute."

Your vigilance appreciated—and honored.

Sincerely,

SHIRLEY COBB.

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

Hon. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CRAMER: I wholeheartedly support your views against the embarrassing situation in which our Government has become involved in the "money for prisoners deal" with Fidel Castro.

I deeply appreciate the position in which you have placed yourself politically by taking this stand and I want you to know that I am with you 100 percent, and if there is anything possible that I can do to help you in this coming campaign, do not hesitate to call on me.

Yours very truly,

W. A. BORDERS.

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

Hon. WILLIAM CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: I, speaking for myself only, do feel you are so right on your stand against negotiations being made with Castro by Attorney James B. Donovan for release of 1,113

Gross national product, budget expenditures, surplus or deficit, cost of living increase, and declining value of the dollar, 1949-62—Continued

¹ From 1963 budget message—original fiscal 1963 budget revenue estimates are based on attaining this rate in calendar 1962. Second quarter rate was \$552.0 billion.

² Second quarter rate.

³ July 1962; new record high.

⁴ July 1962; new record low.

Sources: Various official documents.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, as will be noted, and as a conclusive reminder of the results of our profligacy, and of our precarious and worsening financial situation, foreign holders of our dollars and claims on our gold have been calling for gold. They are apprehensive. We cannot expect them to maintain faith in our dollar when we ourselves so heedlessly and so consistently continue to depreciate it. It is our dollar; not theirs. If we will not respect its traditional value, neither will they.

The President's state of the Union address to Congress at the beginning of this session ranked inflation in the forefront of the enemies of freedom. He also submitted a budget in balance—precariouly, tenuously, it is true, but nonetheless slightly in balance. And he urged the cooperation of the Congress to keep it in balance. Of course, like so many past budgets, its balance was prospectively arrived at; it rested on estimated uncertainties as to revenues. Like so many past budgets, it violated rules of prudence by failing to allow clear safety margins as a hedge against overoptimism. For months the financial writers and market analysts have been saying we would incur another deficit. It is now clear—and universally conceded—that we will close the fiscal year again deeply in the red. In the last 8 years, 1955-62, final results, for a variety of reasons, varied from original budget predictions and recommendations by over \$28 billion—that much deeper than had been originally budgeted.

Jefferson's admonition is particularly applicable in this emergency:

I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared. To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our choice between economy and liberty or profusion and servitude. If we run into such debts, we must be taxed in our meat and drink, in our necessities and our comforts, in our labors and in our amusements. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people, under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy.

Mr. Speaker, but for the indefatigable labor and sound business judgment of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and others who have stood with him during his 40 years of dedicated service to the reduction of the budgets, the national debt, frightening and dangerous as it is—the national debt would be even billions and billions higher today. When the gentleman from New York, JOHN TABER, came to the House in 1923, the national debt was \$22 billion. Today it is \$302 billion—and going higher.

When JOHN TABER came to the House in 1923, the annual expenditure of the

Government was \$3 billion. Today it is \$115 billion—and going higher.

When JOHN TABER came to the House in 1923, there were 536,000 Federal employees. Today there are 2,514,000—and there will be more.

The inescapable consequences in store for us if this trend continues indefinitely are unpredictable. In this situation we are not in position to further expand the Federal establishment or undertake additional obligations beyond those absolutely essential. On the contrary it is high time we took carefully considered measures to retrench expenditures, put in motion efforts to reduce surplus activities, reduce the cost of living, and adopt a program for methodical and periodical reduction of the public debt.

[Mr. HALLECK addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

THE 2D SESSION OF THE 87TH CONGRESS

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 3 minutes.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished minority leader in his tribute to retiring Members. I want particularly to pay tribute to my Democratic colleagues who will not be with us next year. They are: Representative BURR P. HARRISON, of Virginia; Representative MERWIN COAD, of Iowa; Representative MORGAN MOULDER, of Missouri; Representative DANIEL BREWSTER, of Maryland; Representative SIDNEY YATES, of Illinois; Representative FRED MARSHALL, of Minnesota; Representative DANIEL INOUE, of Hawaii; Representative BRENT SPENCE, of Kentucky; Representative IRIS F. BLITCH, of Georgia; Representative CATHERINE NORRELL, of Arkansas; Representative CORINNE RILEY, of South Carolina; Representative GRACIE FROST, of Idaho; Representative VICTOR ANFUSO, of New York; Representative KATHRYN GRANAHAN, of Pennsylvania; Representative FRANK BOYKIN, of Alabama; Representative FRANK SMITH, of Mississippi; Representative FRANK KOWALSKI, of Connecticut; Representative HAROLD MCSWEEN, of Louisiana; Representative DALE ALFORD, of Arkansas; Representative JAMES FRAZIER, of Tennessee; Representative HERBERT ZELENGO, of New York; Representative JAMES C. DAVIS, of Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, the 2d session of the 87th Congress has been notable in many respects and in its waning hours I should like to comment very briefly and generally concerning those events and the great personalities which carried them forward. Although we have been constrained to spend more time in session than is usual, and at considerable sac-

rice for many of our Members, I believe we can now lay down our burdens secure in the knowledge that we have met our legislative obligations to the best of our ability and that the record of this session bears the stamp of solid accomplishment in many vital areas, both domestic and foreign.

The House now concludes its first year of operation under the guidance of the gentleman from Massachusetts, Speaker MCCORMACK, whose leadership has been ably and adroitly executed during the past 10 months. His performance during this time of stress and unprecedented challenge has been outstanding. His reputation as one of the truly great Speakers of this House is sealed with the record of this session. I extend my personal thanks to the Speaker for the many, many considerations he has shown me. I believe my appreciation also expresses the sense of the Members on both sides of the aisle.

The Speaker loves and seeks to serve with fairness and dedication every Member of the House. As the devoted leader of his party he has given skilled effort and tireless attention to the great program of President Kennedy.

The leadership is deeply in the debt of its Democratic whip, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] and his assistant whips, for the truly magnificent work they have done during this session. They have been extremely accurate in their polls on legislative matters. For outstanding and devoted assistance on so many occasions, I personally am deeply indebted to my friend and coworker, the gentleman from Louisiana, HALE BOGGS.

I can find no adequate words to give full expression to the gratitude I feel toward all the Members of the House, both Democrats and Republicans, for the many kindnesses they have shown me. Members of my own party have given me support and help of a measure far greater than I could have hoped to receive.

My Republican friends have shown me innumerable courtesies. I extend my thanks to all of them and particularly to their distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and to the very able minority whip, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]. They have been most kind and considerate to me in all personal matters and in all matters involving the efficient and orderly operation of the House. They are great Americans and I am happy to say they are my personal friends.

Without the cooperation and state-manship of the minority leadership the course of this House would have been far less stable, and far less productive in the very vital areas of our national defense and foreign policy. For if we are divided by political ideology, we are united by mutual recognition of our common purpose to serve our people and our country above all else.

The Members of the House have given lavishly to this body and to the Nation, of the best of their talents, almost entirely of their time, and with superb de-

termination to meet the myriad challenges and problems which have faced them constantly during this session.

The Members of the House, its officers, and employees, all have given tireless devotion and effort during this long and arduous session. Our Parliamentarian, Lew Deshler, whose workday and workload are exceeded only by his great talents and knowledge, was ill for a few days last week but we are fortunate now to have him back among us during the closing hours of this session. Lew Deshler has no peer in his field. His services are essential to the functioning of the House. He has been a bulwark of strength not only in his capacity as the leading parliamentarian of the world but as a wise and experienced servant of this House. He has through every hour of every session been the strong, indispensable right arm of the leadership on both sides of the aisle.

I hope that the months ahead will bring opportunity for rest and relaxation for the Members and officers and employees, all of whom have worked hard and deserve a time away from their strenuous routines. Again I thank you for your friendship and your help. I wish for each and every one of you good health and good fortune, in the present and in the future.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY PRESIDENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 835

Resolved, That a committee of two Members be appointed by the House to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed their business of the session and are ready to adjourn unless the President has some further communication to make to them.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as Members on the part of the House of the committee to notify the President the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

NATIONAL FISHERIES CENTER AND AQUARIUM ADVISORY BOARD

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 5(a), Public Law 87-758, the Chair appoints as members of the National Fisheries Center and Aquarium Advisory Board the following Members on the part of the House: The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

WORK PLANS RECOMMENDED UNDER WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read by the Clerk and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

OCTOBER 11, 1962.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
The Speaker,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection

and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Public Works has approved the work plans transmitted to you which were referred to this committee. The work plans involved are:

State	Watershed	Executive Communication No.	Committee approval
Alabama	Town Creek	2289	Oct. 2, 1962
Delaware and Pennsylvania	Brandywine Creek	2424	Do.
Georgia	Tobesofkee Creek (supplemental)	2635	Do.
Kansas	Twin Caney	2424	Do.
Oklahoma	Upper Blue River	2289	Do.
Do.	Cottonwood Creek	2635	Do.
Do.	Delaware Creek	2635	Do.
Pennsylvania	Sandy Creek	2424	Do.
South Carolina	Thicketty Creek	2289	Do.
Texas	Salado Creek	2424	Do.
Do.	Valley Creek	2424	Do.
Wyoming	Boulder Lake	2572	Do.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

(Mr. GRAY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

[Mr. GRAY'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

MATTER OF CONSCIENCE

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, in the Cuban ransom blackmail deal, it is becoming more evident that the attempt to raise moneys, foodstuffs, and medicines to be turned over to Castro to help keep him in power, could properly be described as a "Kennedy Conscience Fund" for the failure of the Bay of Pigs invasion. The following editorial from the Tampa Tribune in my district indicates that this is what that newspaper thinks, which is in support of what I have been saying:

MATTER OF CONSCIENCE

The more that leaks out about the proposed ransoming of the 1,113 Cuban invasion prisoners, the worse the deal looks for the United States.

All the signs suggest that the ransom is not only approved by President Kennedy but that most of the food, medicine, and money handed over to Fidel Castro will come from American taxpayers. Nobody knows what the final agreement may call for but Castro originally demanded \$62 million; if he knows that the President is behind the negotiations, he is not likely to settle for less.

And Castro can hardly fail to know. The New York World-Telegram said yesterday that the American negotiator, New York lawyer James B. Donovan, was given the assignment last June by none other than Attorney General Robert Kennedy.

An earlier tipoff came in a column by Joseph Alsop, published on this page Tuesday. Alsop, who is close to the Kennedys, said in effect that the President had decided to ransom the prisoners as a matter of conscience, because he was responsible for the bungled invasion.

A further clue is the fact that the committee of Cuban exiles which for some months has been attempting to raise the ransom money by private donation has had little success. The only fairy godmother with the equivalent of \$60 million to drop in

the pot is the Federal Government. The money presumably could be taken from the funds of the Central Intelligence Agency, which makes no public accounting of its spending.

Now, we have deep sympathy for the 1,113 captives and all the thousands of less-publicized prisoners rotting in Castro's jails. We also can appreciate President Kennedy's lacerations of conscience, from the nagging knowledge that his denial of air support wrecked the invasion and caused the capture of most of the little army of freedom fighters.

But there are more than the welfare of prisoners and the mental comfort of the President to consider.

There are, for example, the national honor and the campaign to free Cuba from communism.

Our prestige suffered enough from the Bay of Pigs defeat, when the world's mightiest nation permitted itself to be humiliated by a Red dwarf. What will Latin America and the rest of the world think of our now buying back the prisoners—instead of rescuing them at gunpoint?

Even worse, perhaps, in the world's view will be the inconsistency of threatening to penalize Allied countries whose ships carry cargoes to Cuba at the very time our Government is preparing to ship to Castro invaluable supplies of food and medicine. Who can understand such a violent contradiction in declared policy?

We are reminded of President Kennedy's stirring words in announcing the failure of the invasion in April 1961. Speaking sternly of the necessity for resolute action to maintain freedom in this hemisphere, he said "the complacent, the self-indulgent, the soft societies will be swept away with the debris of history."

Ransoming the prisoners, we submit, is the course of softness. Unless the President begins to meet the Cuban problem with some of the promised toughness of spirit, more of free Latin America will become debris on the Red tide. And Mr. Kennedy then will have on his conscience not 1,113 prisoners but millions.

UNANIMOUS OPPOSITION EXPRESSED TO BLACKMAIL RANSOM PROPOSALS BY CASTRO TO FREE CUBAN PRISONERS

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, with the negotiations of James Donovan with Castro for the payment of

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

22241

with much needed dollars, foodstuffs, and medicines, all of which he can trade off for more war materiel to be used against the United States of America and the freedom-loving countries of this hemisphere, and which he can use to build up communism in other countries in this hemisphere. That is what is wrong with this whole deal.

I hope that puts it in focus. Now, where are we? As of now we find Mr. Donovan back in Miami. Negotiations have been going on for months. I understand the Ransom Committee started in April and Donovan interceded in early August 1962.

The American people have not been told this. The American people are not told even now what the deal is. The American people have not been advised. The American people do not know what authority Mr. Donovan has to negotiate in regard to contributions by this Nation or its people to this ransom deal.

When I inquired of the State Department about it they admitted that they were doing "contingency planning." That is a good gobbledygook term, is it not? "Contingency planning" in the event that a request came from Mr. Donovan and the committee for contributions on the part of the United States.

I asked the State Department's Mr. Robert A. Hurwitch, Assistant Secretary of State, about this "contingency planning," "What authority do you have to spend 5 cents in paying ransom to an enemy, payment by the Government of the United States to Fidel Castro?" I have never knowingly and intentionally voted a nickel that could be used by the Government of the United States as payment to an enemy government, to Castro or communism.

He said in that respect that that, too, is part of the "contingency planning" to determine where moneys or foodstuffs or other matters of value are that could be made available to the committee. Is there any doubt that it is being given consideration?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. May I say to the gentleman from Florida in regard to the taxpayer's funds being used for a contingency of that kind that as a member of the subcommittee making appropriations for the State Department I would say there is no money that has been appropriated for that purpose. They never have submitted any request for money for that purpose.

As one member of the committee I shall inquire next year whether any has been used, and if it has, we will bring it to the attention of the House. But I would serve notice on the State Department now that here is no money that has been appropriated by our committee for that purpose. I would think they would be making a great mistake if they used funds appropriated for other purposes for any such purpose as the gentleman has now referred to.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman. I agree this should be the case. I think the gentleman is referring like-

wise to the Central Intelligence Agency. I am confident no one in this body has voted for those appropriations thinking they could be used for that purpose.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I want to commend the gentleman from Florida for the campaign he has carried on in the last several days on this issue and say to him I thoroughly agree that not one dime of the American taxpayers should be spent for the liberation of the Cuban prisoners without the express authorization of Congress. This would be, it seems to me, the worst kind of tribute paid to Fidel Castro. I am sure the gentleman knows and every Member of the House knows that the money thus expended would be paid over eventually to the Russians.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman. He put his finger exactly on the problem. I go further and say that dollars collected by the voluntary ransom committee likewise gives Castro just as much support and are of just as much value to him. That, too, should not be permitted.

I started to discuss briefly these negotiations. Look where the United States of America now is. We find that Mr. Donovan is back in Miami probably conferring with Mr. Greenfield, a representative of the State Department in project X. All this mystery, with no information made available to the American public. We find Mr. Donovan suggesting that there is a hitch in the negotiations. I assume the hitch is, and my best information is that the hitch is that Mr. Castro, wanting to get as much advantage as he can out of this propaganda-wise—and do not think he is the only one behind this. Do not think Khrushchev is not giving him advice on how to get the most propaganda advantage out of this. They are going to drag it along a little while, let the whole world know that the United States of America is willing to get on its knees to Fidel Castro, the puppet of Red China and Russia in Cuba.

So they are upping the ante—dragging on the negotiations—ask for more of everything—more money, more foodstuffs, more medicine, additional guarantees, supply new lists that Castro wants filled, change the ground rules. How long is this humiliating experience going on? He must have gotten word from Khrushchev. He must have gotten word from Mao Tse-tung that he is making points in the world propaganda-wise—keep it up, keep the United States of America on its knees, let the world know Mr. Donovan who has authority to negotiate from the U.S. Government that he is on his knees to Fidel Castro, Khrushchev and Mao must be saying. The asininity of this thing. How did we ever get ourselves in such a position is hardly understandable to me.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I have been interested to know how Mr. Donovan gets into the picture and what interest he has in this business. Who is financing him? What authority has he been delegated by the U.S. Government? Why do we have highly paid diplomats by the score? Are they unable to carry on negotiations, if negotiations should be carried on? Is this administration saying it is necessary to find someone from outside of the Government to carry on these negotiations? I do not understand the situation at all.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman is asking many questions that, I am sure, are in the minds of the American people as well as people throughout the world. This man has no portfolio. This man has no Senate confirmation. This man has not put his credentials before the American people for examination. This man is a private citizen.

I always felt the Logan Act prevented a citizen of the United States from dealing with foreign countries, even a friendly country let alone an enemy. So the only way that he could be negotiating without violating the law would be if he had "the authority of the United States" to do so. So we can only assume that he does have, but I hasten to add he should never have gotten that kind of permission from me. So we are being forced now to get down on our knees and crawl before Castro and the Communists and to accede to the indemnity demands resulting from this abortive invasion failure and to accede to the demands for ransom of a bearded, power hungry madman, Fidel Castro, who is threatening the security of this entire hemisphere. That gives the Communists a beachhead in this hemisphere the likes of which they never had in the history of communism. Now they want us to crawl even more. It is time to put a stop to it.

I wrote for consideration of my resolution calling for an end to this humiliation and aid to Castro. This is some of the unresolved business of this session. The request follows:

OCTOBER 11, 1962.

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman, the Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am deeply disturbed by reports that the President, through Mr. Donovan, is negotiating to bargain away American dollars and/or foodstuffs to Communist Castro who recently, in a strong resolution passed by the House, was declared to be an enemy of the U.S. Government, and it appears from the latest news reports that there are proposals being made to pay him in dollars from CIA funds.

This is about the greatest abuse of Presidential discretion as I can remember in the history of this country because I, as a Member of Congress, have at no time, knowingly or intentionally, ever voted for any funds, CIA or in any other authorization or appropriation bill, that would permit the President to spend taxpayers' money to pay off ransom and indemnity demands, to give into blackmail threats by an enemy government and, in particular, Fidel Castro.

As you know, I have pending House Concurrent Resolution 459, which provides: "That it is the sense of Congress that this Government oppose the trading of dollars for humans as proposed by the Communist government of Cuba and request the President

October 13

to withhold any further Executive approval of such commerce or trade with the enemy, to refuse to permit the issuance of visas to visitors to Cuba for purposes of negotiation, to refuse to permit shipment or payment of such dollars to Cuba from the United States, and to refuse to permit gifts and contributions made for such a trade to be deducted for income tax purposes."

In view of the emergency nature of this situation, and the obvious public indignation against it, as evidenced in the tractor deal which was finally disallowed by the President, and this obviously being contrary to the basic policy established by Congress itself just a few weeks ago in the Cuban resolution, I am asking for immediate hearings by your committee to consider this entire matter and my resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 459.

The people are entitled to know all the facts and I am confident that the Congress of the United States does not want to be a party to the appropriation of money or foodstuffs to be turned over to Fidel Castro. America demands that Castro and communism in this hemisphere be defeated—not supported.

If the Congress does not stop this unwholesome, degrading, and humiliating blackmail deal, the prestige of the United States will be forever irreparably harmed. I am extremely sympathetic to the Bay of Pigs invasion forces held in prison but I call your attention to the fact that, according to the Department of State, American prisoners are being held in Cuba, as well as in North Korea and in Red China, and no effort is being made for their release because of our strong policy against the ransoming of prisoners. Likewise, all of Cuba is a prison under Castro, let alone the hundreds of thousands who are known to be in jail, and our efforts should be to help the Cuban refugees free their entire country rather than put that date off indefinitely by supporting Castro and his Communist regime to the tune of \$60 million. This deal is an American surrender of principles and appeasement of communism.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

WILLIAM C. CRAMER.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., May 28, 1962.

Hon. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CRAMER: This is in response to your letters of April 25, 1962, to the President and to me, about the deductibility of contributions to the Cuban Families Committee for the Liberation of Prisoners of War, Inc.

Our records show that the committee filed an application in August 1961, with the Internal Revenue Service requesting exemption from income tax as an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. The committee also requested a determination that contributions made to it would be deductible by the donors in accordance with section 170 of the code.

Early in October, in amplification of its request, the committee informed the Internal Revenue Service that it hoped to negotiate the release of prisoners by the Castro regime in exchange for tractors. This related back to the earlier Castro demands, and at no time from the filing of the original application to the tentative granting of the exemption on December 6, was there prior knowledge, as your letter suggests, of any new Castro prisoner trade offer.

Section 501(c)(3) provides that corporations and foundations which are "organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific . . . (and) educational purposes" shall be exempt from taxation. Contributions to organizations which enjoy exempt status under section 501(c)(3) are

deductible under the provisions of code section 170. The application and supplemental evidence submitted by the committee indicate that its primary purpose, on which its entitlement to exemption depends, is the liberation, relief and rehabilitation of the prisoners now being held in Cuba. Throughout history the redemption of prisoners has been regarded as a charitable activity. Similarly, it has frequently been recognized that the relief and rehabilitation of persons in distress is charitable.

Since the purposes for which the committee was formed fall within the exemption provisions of the code, the organization was tentatively granted exemption by the Service in a letter ruling dated December 6, 1961. The letter states that if the committee is operated in accordance with its stated purposes and in the manner indicated by the evidence submitted, it will be entitled to exemption from Federal income tax and contributions received by it will be tax deductible. Before the issuance of the December 6 ruling letter, we were advised by the Justice Department that the activities of the committee would not entail any violation of the Logan Act. Also, we were informed by the State Department that there were no objections to the issuance of a favorable ruling from a foreign policy point of view.

You have requested that the ruling issued to the committee be rescinded. However, we believe that under a proper construction of the applicable provisions of the Internal Revenue Code and on the basis of the facts submitted to us, the committee is entitled to exempt status. Therefore, we can see no appropriate legal basis for the revocation of the tentative ruling issued to the organization.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. On October 6 the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CANNON) obtained unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes at the appropriate time on the last day of the session. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I have just taken advantage of that leave and have introduced that material at the close of my remarks following the last bill.

(Mr. GALLAGHER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GALLAGHER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. VANIK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. VANIK'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. VANIK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. VANIK'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. VANIK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. VANIK'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

BRIEF SUMMARY OF MAJOR LEGISLATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF 87TH CONGRESS

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to give the House a brief summary of the major legislative accomplishments of the 87th Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks, I will insert in the Appendix of the Record at a later date a more detailed statement.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, the work of this Congress will be applauded wherever freedom finds voice.

In both sessions of this historic Congress, 1961 and 1962, President Kennedy has seen enacted into law an unusually high percentage of his recommendations. This great body of forward-looking legislation sets the foundations for a new decade of peace, progress, and prosperity in the challenging 1960's.

Two illustrious names in American history have guided these sessions in the House—the revered Sam Rayburn, of Texas, in the first session, and the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, in the second. We owe a public tribute to these great architects of effective self-government.

By building impregnable military security we have renewed and revitalized the constructive forces of growth and progress everywhere in the free world.

And our own internal security has been strengthened and buttressed by new legislation to punish espionage, subversion, and betrayal at home.

The world around, the whole structure of freedom commands new authority, dignity, and power.

America faces the future with unblinking confidence, for everywhere the evil powers of destruction and moral decay are in check before the awesome might of freedom under God.

Looking back 20 months to the opening days of the 87th Congress, in January 1961, the Nation now sees clearly that our legislative program has been successful on two fronts—a broad offense against Communist aggression and subversion around the world, and a daring new offensive against distress, disaster, unemployment, and economic dislocation at home.

No boast is hinted that all of our challenging problems of national development have been solved. But we have recorded an inspiring effort to advance the central aspirations of our times—world peace, national security, and solid economic growth in a beckoning climate of justice and human dignity.

Throughout these 2 years, we have hammered out on the anvil of free debate in the Halls of Congress virtually all of the great issues and problems of our day.

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

22239

to why this redemption of prisoners or ransom of prisoners is considered to be a charitable activity, the Secretary said, and I read again:

Throughout history the redemption of prisoners has been regarded as a charitable activity.

And I will include the entire incredible letter at the end of my remarks.

Let us bring this thing in focus. That leads to the conclusion of providing \$62 million to Fidel Castro whom the President himself called the enemy of the United States, by invoking the Trading with the Enemy Act effective February 7, 1962, which the President did to cut off the importation of Havana cigars coming in even through third friendly countries like Canada or the Canary Islands. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 5847, April 11, 1962. The President by invoking the Trading with the Enemy Act through Presidential proclamation declared Fidel Castro, and properly so, as an enemy of free nations of the world and the United States in particular. Yet, with this Treasury ruling, we find the typical inconsistent position of the New Frontier—talk tough and use a powder puff—we find the New Frontier at this time permitting the collection of \$62 million that is going to be used for what purpose? I am just as sympathetic to the prisoners as anybody else. I realize and so does everyone in the world how they got there. It was because they were not given the air coverage at the Bay of Pigs that they were entitled to and promised. But I want to free all the people in Cuba. I want to see the 6 million people who live in Cuba free. They are all prisoners of communism and Castro. If we free 1,113 who are now in prison, is Castro going to make another demand on the other 100,000 Cubans in prison in Cuba? If we set this precedent, what are we faced with in the future, the great powerful freedom-loving United States of America? We are faced with a precedent of paying money in ransom for prisoners. To whom? To the enemy. Of paying indemnity to the enemy.

I thought our historical answer to such demands has been—"Millions for defense—not one cent for tribute."

That should be our answer today.

What is going to be the result? What is Fidel Castro going to do with this money? That is the point. What is the Cuban Government, the Communists, going to do with this money, and drugs, and foodstuffs?

Fidel Castro is going to use them to keep himself and the Communists and the many Russian technicians, and Red Chinese in Cuba, to keep them in power and continue to subject the 6 million citizens of Cuba to virtual slavery. That is what we are contributing to.

That is why I am opposed to this abortive proposal and have been from its inception with the April 17 failure of the invasion of 1961. If you recall, I introduced a resolution opposing the tractors deal just a few weeks after it was made. So we have to keep our minds on what is going to happen by giving this ransom aid. It is going to permit Fidel

Castro to stay in power, to permit the Communists to stay in power and to subjugate the 6 million people in Cuba, and at the same time challenge the freedoms of the rest of the Western Hemisphere, challenge it by exporting Communists to other countries of the hemisphere—even with arms.

I say this is wrong. And the gentleman from Illinois the other day said critically that I should be the general to lead the invasion forces. I would suggest that the gentleman from Illinois aid me, follow me, rather than criticize me—not necessarily as a general leading the invasion with words, as he said, but I am at least not guilty of being silent in opposing this abortive proposal that is against everything that we stand for, the dignity of America, the freedom of the hemisphere, and a strong position in opposition to atheistic communism.

Look where we are today. What position are we in? We find that Mr. Donovan, who just happens to be a candidate for the U.S. Senate in New York, we find he was designated many months ago to do this negotiating. He obviously was given permission to do so.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I will yield after I have finished.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman is making a fine statement. It should be taken seriously. What concerns me is that the administration is still making Berlin its first and only challenge by the Communists and fails to watch out for Cuba, and the direct threat of the large military build-up to the United States, the American people, and the free world. Possibly Berlin is a diversion, with only small forces involved at present, but a two-headed thrust, when Cuba is carefully considered. I cannot understand why the administration thinks a military base in Cuba, could be "defensive." Why?

I believe that Cuba is equal to the challenge of communism that Berlin is. I know this from firsthand personal observation within the past 2 weeks.

On September 29 and 30, 1962, I went to the U.S. Guantanamo Naval Base in Cuba and was there for several days working hard to get firsthand information for our U.S. security. It was a serious trip. We were flown into Guantanamo escorted by two U.S. fighter jets, and we were flown out escorted by two U.S. fighter jets. That shows it is serious business.

When I was there I was shocked to find that there are 3,200 Cuban employees employed at the Guantanamo Naval Base in Cuba, and 2,400 of them go home in the Cuban territory in Oriente Province every evening. These are the people that run the shipyard, and include craftsmen, metalworkers, welders, drillers, carpenters, every kind of a trade that we have in oversupply in the United States. These are the workers in this greatest U.S. naval base and shipyard. Why not American workmen?

I am from the city of Pittsburgh, and we have a tremendous number of un-

employed in heavy industry trained in this type of work, yet we cannot get the administration people to employ these people at the Guantanamo Naval Base in Cuba.

Why this discrimination against American citizens, trained U.S. workers, and U.S. jobless veterans?

Castro's government in Cuba could shut our naval base down overnight by blocking the entry of these workers and diverting them as a ready made task force to the new Soviet-financed base now building near Havana. Guantanamo is the largest U.S. Navy base we have any place in the world, and ship basic repairs for the whole U.S. Atlantic Fleet are made here. Castro could shut Guantanamo down overnight simply by preventing the 2,400 employees from going in on any particular morning.

Another trouble is this: Because of this Cuban payroll, between \$6 and \$8 million in U.S. cash is going into Castro's coffers to keep Communism going in Cuba. That is being supported and paid for by U.S. taxpayers through payments made to these Cuban employees.

One of the tragedies of the Cuban situation is that at Guantanamo Bay we have only 1,500 military servicemen stationed there. Navy ships come and go, but they are not shore based. There are 3,200 Cuban employees who are able to take the U.S. Guantanamo base over at any given moment, many of them just as well physically built and equipment trained as any of the U.S. servicemen we have there.

Another problem that struck me very seriously is the neglect of this administration in not having the planes parked on the base runways protected at any time. There are no embankments or concrete revetments. Those planes are there just awaiting another Pearl Harbor. We need action for defense at Guantanamo and the base needs construction quick to modernize all installations. I am sure base personnel will heartily concur if asked.

Just 3 miles out of the base on one side, beyond Suicide Ridge, on one of the high hills beyond the Guantanamo Naval Base is a gun emplacement with large guns aimed right down into the naval base of the United States. In the other direction, about 5 miles away, there is another small mountain or high hill with more guns and artillery aiming down into the U.S. naval base. What are we doing about this?

At the base, we are yet unable to supply our own water, and have to depend on an outside Cuban water company. The source of supply is 4 or 5 miles outside the U.S. naval base. We have only a pipe coming out of there. There is no guard by the United States either on the reservoir or on the water system in the Cuban area. There is just one pipe, so that could be shut off at any time. We need salt water conversion equipment, and quick.

The administration should make clear we are putting standby carriers down there with an adequate reserve supply of water in case of a long siege, if necessary.

October 13

When I was there I learned about what was happening on the materials being shipped into Cuba at present.

The amount, description, and size of shipments is shocking.

Mr. Speaker, the point that struck me so forcefully was the rate of shipping going into Cuban ports. These ships consisted of large-mast ships of new design, laden part way up the mast in many instances, and on other occasions you could see from photographs that they had gun mounts, plane parts, missile-carrying PT boats on the decks.

Mr. Speaker, these ships are not going in one or two at a time. For the week ending September 29, when I was there, there were over 200 ships which went into Cuban ports under full steam taking military and civilian supplies that Cuba so badly needs. That is at the rate of 10,000 ships a year going to Cuba, and over half of them are ships which come from our so-called friends and allies of the free world and the neutralist countries.

That means there are 100 ships a week from the Communist bloc countries going into Cuba carrying ammunition and military supplies, which even this administration admits is at the rate of millions of dollars a year.

To me this is a major destructive threat to the whole of the State of Florida and to every State in the eastern part of the United States, and is a destructive threat to the security of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that by only passing resolutions on Cuba and hitting with the powderpuff, and sending strong words to Khrushchev on Berlin, this administration is making a real mistake. We must be firm on Cuba.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman for his remarks, and I shall be glad to yield further when I have finished a few remarks that I have to make on this subject. Of course, the gentleman is eminently correct in many of his observations.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield further to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I have been advised that there are over 200 Mig planes now based in Cuba, and there has even been seen a Mig 21, their latest model. This is a tremendous threat to the United States, because with proper remodeling and change the Mig 19's and Mig 21's can carry 1,000-pound nuclear weapons which will endanger any American city up to about an 800-mile range. This is a real threat, in my opinion, and I think we need firm action on Cuba. The President should immediately meet with Prime Minister Khrushchev and make plain the U.S. position and our intended strong steps to protect ourselves, the Western Hemisphere, and the free world.

Mr. CRAMER. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks and his support of my position in bringing out some facts of tremendous importance. Of course, the gentleman's discussion of the buildup militarily in Cuba is the best evidence of the fact that we should not give to Castro

any American dollars which are being collected by this ransom committee, or any foodstuffs or any medicine that Castro can use to trade to Red China and Russia and certainly not any taxpayer-supported funds or foodstuffs. As we all know, they need foodstuffs and medicines and they certainly would like to have American dollars to help build up their war materiel, their big machine—that the administration admits has imported at least \$200 million worth of war materiel, making them the second military power in this hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, there is no excuse in the world for this, by direction, indirection, or regardless of the amount of compassion which we may have for the prisoners, and I have as much compassion as anyone else. I do not believe that we should help Castro stay in power. Castro admittedly, as all other Communist nations, have a serious food shortage, because the agrarian reforms which were pushed have not been successful, not only in Cuba, but anywhere in the Communist world. So, he needs foodstuffs badly. For what? To stay in power, to keep from losing control of Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, how humiliating a position do we find ourselves in with these negotiations? We find a gentleman by the name of Donovan, whom I say just happens to be a candidate for the U.S. Senate in New York, negotiating on behalf of whom? The prisoners' committee, supposedly. But, he could not be negotiating or he would be violating the Logan Act, unless he had "the authority of the United States" to do so. There is not any question about it. He must have the authority of the Government of the United States. He has been in and out of the Attorney General's office on a number of occasions. The State Department has conferred with him. I would venture to say that he is being conferred with right now in Miami, assuming he is still there, because the State Department has in Miami at this time a representative, Mr. James L. Greenfield, the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Information, Bureau of Public Affairs, who is at Homestead, Fla., now, and has been for some time.

He is in charge of what the administration calls mysteriously—this whole thing has been mysterious—Project X. Project X is the preparation for the importation of the prisoners and the co-operation of the State Department to bring it about. So there is no doubt but what this not only has the condonation but the full back of the administration and is contrary to the best interests of this country.

I have asked the question, Does not this administration have compassion for Americans who are in prison in Cuba? I provided for the Record this week a list of 10 Americans who are in prison. The New Frontier is letting American prisoners rot in prisons around the world, including 21 in Cuban jails, on trumped-up charges, while backing the Cuban prisoner ransom blackmail deal as indemnity to Communist Castro because of the abortive failure of the invasion at the Bay of Pigs.

I charge that some 21 prisoners are held in jail largely on bogus charges, and many of them are in ill health. They are being mistreated, many of them. They are underfed. But we hear little of efforts to get them out of prison, while every administration pressure that can be brought to bear is being used to get the release of the Cuban prisoners, including the making of the contributions to the Cuban Ransom Committee tax deductible, as I said before; sending Donovan to get on his knees in the name of the United States, to Castro, and influencing American pharmaceutical and food houses to make contributions to the Cuban Ransom Committee and even planning to put in U.S. funds if needed.

Compassion for Cuban prisoners? Si. Compassion for American prisoners? No. That seems to be the policy of the New Frontier apparently, because the whole philosophy of this blackmail deal that the administration is trying to sell to the American people is a deal that helps Castro and the Communists stay in power with medicines, foodstuffs, and drugs, and is to apologize for the invasion failure. Maybe this whole contribution program ought to be renamed. Maybe they ought to call it the Kennedy conscience fund, instead.

The State Department refuses to give me the names of the prisoners, the 21 prisoners in the Cuban jails; 4 being held against their will in Red China; 1 in Russia; 4 unaccounted for in North Korea. Where is our compassion for our own citizens who are being held by the Communists throughout the world, if ransom is to be the sorry, humiliating approach? It is obvious that ransom and indemnity have never been the approach of this great country in fighting for freedom.

Despite the refusal of the State Department to give me the names of the Cuban prisoners I have been able to acquire the names of 18 of them, and here they are as reported to me by the only source available to me: Rafael del Pino, of New York and Miami; Austin Young, of Miami; James Wellington King, of Miami; Donald Joe Green, of York, S.C.; Alfred E. Gibson, of Mount Gilbuss, N.C.; James G. Dean, of Franklinville, N.C.; Thomas Baker of Dothan, Ala.; Eustace Danbrent, of Baltimore, Md.; Daniel Carswell, of East Chester, N.Y.; and Edmond Taransky, of New York City.

Those names I published earlier in the week. These are the others: Miss Marilyn Menger, of Miami. I do not know where the rest of them are from, but here are the names: Dario Frohias Bello, Martha O'Neal, Robert John Gentile, Juana Pedro Koop, Peter Joe Lambton, Richard Allen Peconaro, Leonard L. Schmidt.

Where is our compassion for these American citizens rotting in Cuban jails? Our attitude about American prisoners seems to be that nothing can be done for them short of efforts to do exactly what we should do, not only for the Cuban prisoners, but to free all of Cuba from Castro and communism. But our attitude about Cuban prisoners is that we must give in to Castro's ransom and indemnity demands and provide him

Franciscan Fathers taught the Indians to build elaborate aqueducts, irrigation ditches and mills. Here is where the Viceroy of Mexico brought Canary Islanders to live and where the Governor's palace was later erected. Over half a century before the cornerstone of this Capitol was laid the cornerstone of our San Fernando Cathedral was laid.

San Antonio became the meeting point of the Spanish-speaking and the English-speaking cultures on the American continents. It continues to have that distinction. But our city is not composed of only English and Spanish. To this city, which was built hundreds of miles beyond the then existing frontier of the United States, there came also the Germans, the French, and the Irish. And from La Villita of the Spanish, Germantown of the Germans, Military Plaza of the Americans, and the Irish flats of the Irish, there has truly been composed, in every sense of that tranquil word, a great and cosmopolitan city around which has grown the ninth most populated congressional district in the United States.

I speak here for San Antonio and the county of Bexar. I do it proudly. There is much for which to be proud that is not told in terms of history, but rather in those terms by which we take the measure of a city.

There is much I could tell you of our industries, our natural resources, our universities, our schools, our hospitals, our research foundations, our agricultural and livestock diversity, our rapidly growing population, our parks, our museums, our art centers, our multiplicity of tourist attractions, our recreational facilities, our trade and commerce and our ready access to Mexico and to the hills and plains of Texas.

Statistics on all these might burden you, for you have your own case to make for your own districts. However, the U.S. Congress has obviously thought well of San Antonio for many, many decades. If it were not so, the Congress would not have placed there so many facilities important to our Nation.

You have known of San Antonio as the home of many important defense installations: Fort Sam Houston, headquarters of the 4th Army, Brooke Army Medical Center, Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio Air Material Area, the Continental Division of the Military Air Transport Service, Lackland Air Force Base, Kelly Air Field, and others.

Past Congresses have known of San Antonio as a good place with good people—a place to which you can entrust the welfare of things important to the Nation and a place to which anyone can go to visit or to live with ease and appreciation.

(Mr. GONZALEZ at the request of Mr. Boggs) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. DANIELS (at the request of Mr. Boggs) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. DANIELS' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

PERSONAL STATEMENT

(Mr. WHITENER (at the request of Mr. Boggs) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, responding to the personal and urgent request of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, I returned to Washington today to be present for the meeting of the House of Representatives.

I had hoped to be here when the call of the House was made at 12, but due to transportation difficulties I did not arrive in time to answer the rollcall.

Although I was not able to have my name recorded as present, I wish to have the Record show my presence soon thereafter.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

(Mr. HEMPHILL (at the request of Mr. Boggs) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, this morning early I received a message from our beloved Speaker of the House asking that I return to Washington for today's session.

I immediately made my plans to return but transportation difficulties delayed my arrival and I did not arrive in the Chamber until the rollcall had been completed. I regret this very much, but I do want the Record to show my presence here for the remainder of today's program.

THE MAJORITY WHIP

(Mr. BOGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to reply to the very gracious remarks made by my distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT]. I have had in this second session of this Congress the responsibility of majority whip. Mr. Speaker, it has been a great pleasure and an honor to work with you and the majority leader of this body.

The name "whip," in my opinion, is a misnomer because what we are trying to do is work with the Members of the House on both sides of the aisle, understand their problems and understand and recognize the fact that all of them represent great districts in this magnificent country of ours.

Mr. Speaker, it has been an honor and a privilege for me to work with you, with the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], and my colleagues on the Republican side.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 293 today I was unavoidably detained. I should like the Record to show that had I been here I would have voted "yea."

REDEEMABLE GROUND RENTS

(Mr. MILLS (at the request of Mr. Boggs) was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the Members of the House the bill, H.R. 8754, introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from Maryland, the Honorable SAM FRIEDEL. This bill has passed the House but no action has been taken on it by the other body.

The problem involved has to do with the treatment of redeemable ground rents, a common arrangement in Maryland. The bill would treat the buyer of property subject to a redeemable ground rent, for tax purposes, as having bought the land. This would make him eligible for the interest deduction and it would treat the seller as having received the current value of the ground rent.

This is a problem that has been unsettled for several years. It is my hope that legislation similar to H.R. 8754 as it passed the House this year can be enacted by Congress early next year. If it can be enacted promptly we will be able to make its application to homeowners retroactive. The application to sellers would, of course, be prospective.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS ACT OF 1959

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 10539) to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to provide additional choice of health benefits plans, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will explain the legislation. It is a very important piece of legislation, and I want the House to know that it has the support of many of us on our side of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I think it is desirable legislation and ought to pass.

(Mr. OLSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, this legislation will correct an inequitable situation that has developed since enactment of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act in 1959—and which was not and could not be foreseen at that time—with regard to participation in the program by employee organizations.

In establishing the Federal employees health benefits program, the Congress gave recognition to the fact that a num-

ber of employee organizations had already arranged group health insurance plans for their members in the absence of a Federal program. Specific provisions were, therefore, made in the law for participation in the program by these organizations in order to avoid the hardships and inequities that might arise if membership in these organizations might be drained off into a separate Federal program. Among the requirements that had to be met by organizations' plans was that they had been in operation on July 1, 1959, and that they apply for approval as carriers before December 31, 1959.

The law, as written, did serve the purpose of affording protection to those employee organizations who already had health benefit plans and who were approved as carriers. There is no evidence that any of them have lost membership.

However, subsequent developments have tended to impose undue hardships on those employee organizations who had no plan of their own or who may not have sought approval as a carrier. There is evidence to the effect that these organizations are losing membership to the organizations who do have health benefit plans.

In testifying before our committee, the national president of the National Association of Post Office Mail Handlers, Watchmen, Messengers, and Group Leaders reported that his organization is losing members in appreciable numbers, mainly because the organization has no health benefits plan. The local union of this organization in New York City has lost over 1,000 in the past 2 years. These employees are being attracted into other organizations which are able to offer a health benefit plan as a recruitment incentive.

The health benefits program was intended, as our committee's original report on the legislation indicated, to facilitate and strengthen the administration of the activities of the Government generally and to improve personnel administration in the Government. It was definitely not intended to be a recruitment aid or incentive for employee organization membership campaigns. It was certainly not the intent of Congress in enacting the legislation to place any employee organization in an unfair position in relation to any other organization.

The remedy for this situation lies in the enactment of H.R. 10539. It will, in effect, "open up" the program for a short period of time—to the end of this year—to any employee organization who may now wish to apply for approval as a carrier. It will eliminate the requirement that employee organization plans must have been in operation on July 1, 1959, and it will permit any organization to apply for approval up to December 31, 1962.

My committee is agreed that, regardless of other considerations, this is the only fair course that can be taken at this time. It further wishes to emphasize that this action should not set a precedent for similar action in the future. This so-called open season will exist for only this one short period of

time and organizations desiring to apply for approval as carriers will only have this opportunity to do so.

It is expected that enactment of this legislation will entail only a nominal increase in certain administrative expenses.

Mr. Speaker, I emphasize again that this legislation seeks only to correct an inequity that has developed and which could not be foreseen when the Federal Employee Benefits Act was enacted. I sincerely urge the prompt enactment of H.R. 10539.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 2(1) of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 710; 5 U.S.C. 3001(1)) is amended by striking out "1959" and inserting in lieu thereof "1962".

(b) Section 4(3) of such Act (73 Stat. 711; 5 U.S.C. 3003(3)) is amended by striking out ", and which on July 1, 1959, provided health benefits to members of the organization".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KIM CHONG KOO

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3215) for the relief of Kim Chong Koo.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kim Chong Koo may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the said Act and a petition may be filed by the Reverend and Mrs. Kenneth J. Mitchell, citizens of the United States, in behalf of the said Kim Chong Koo pursuant to section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RANSOM OF CUBAN PRISONERS—OR AID TO CASTRO AND COMMUNISM—OR CASTRO'S BLACKMAIL ATTEMPT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, it appears we are adjourning barely before

the frost is on the pumpkin, as a matter of fact, just barely before the frost is on the pumpkin in northern Florida. However, there is substantial unfinished business before this Congress.

One item to which this Congress should have given consideration was the series of resolutions opposing the Cuban ransom deal which I introduced which would have had the effect, first, House Concurrent Resolution 479, May 31, 1962, of reversing the ruling of the Internal Revenue Service which has finally come properly to light in the morning papers, which declares that the ransoming of prisoners is "a charitable purpose." The ransoming of Cuban prisoners is a charitable purpose, according to the Treasury Department. Under the internal revenue laws, therefore, anyone making contributions to the Cuban Prisoner Committee can get tax deductions, so by the back door the taxpayers, as the result of loss of revenue to the Treasury, are paying a part of the bill.

The second resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 322, May 1961, would have vetoed in the first instance the \$20 million tractor-for-prisoner blackmail proposal and in the second instance House Concurrent Resolution 459, April 11, 1962, the \$62 million for prisoners blackmail proposed by Fidel Castro. This proposal of ransom and of indemnity—I think to put the thing in proper focus it is important to point out that Fidel Castro from the beginning has been demanding indemnity, and he has been demanding that this country pay to his country for damages done by the abortive invasion in the Bay of Pigs that failed.

There has never been any doubt in his mind what the money would be for—indemnity or ransom.

I was utterly amazed and I might say shocked a few months ago when I received from the Internal Revenue Department when I inquired, which resulted from my introduction of House Concurrent Resolution 459 which would have abrogated the preliminary regulation that provides that money contributed to the Cuban Prisoner Committee would be tax deductible, that the Secretary of the Treasury, Douglas Dillon, in his letter to me in April based the decision of the Internal Revenue Service on this theory, and can you imagine such a theory?

Throughout history the redemption of prisoners has been regarded as a charitable activity.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I am very interested in what the gentleman is saying, and his interest in this whole matter. I hope the gentleman will expand on and explain a bit more the background of the quotation that he has just given to us.

Mr. CRAMER. I would be delighted to do so. Can you imagine that theory? I wrote the Secretary and challenged him to cite examples. Quoting from Secretary Dillon's letter on the theory as

Gross national product, budget expenditures, surplus or deficit, cost of living increase, and declining value of the dollar, 1949-62—Continued

¹ From 1963 budget message—original fiscal 1963 budget revenue estimates are based on attaining this rate in calendar 1962. Second quarter rate was \$552.0 billion.

² Second quarter rate.

³ July 1962; new record high.

⁴ July 1962; new record low.

Sources: Various official documents.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, as will be noted, and as a conclusive reminder of the results of our profligacy, and of our precarious and worsening financial situation, foreign holders of our dollars and claims on our gold have been calling for gold. They are apprehensive. We cannot expect them to maintain faith in our dollar when we ourselves so heedlessly and so consistently continue to depreciate it. It is our dollar; not theirs. If we will not respect its traditional value, neither will they.

The President's state of the Union address to Congress at the beginning of this session ranked inflation in the forefront of the enemies of freedom. He also submitted a budget in balance—precari-ously, tenuously, it is true, but nonetheless slightly in balance. And he urged the cooperation of the Congress to keep it in balance. Of course, like so many past budgets, its balance was prospectively arrived at; it rested on estimated uncertainties as to revenues. Like so many past budgets, it violated rules of prudence by failing to allow clear safety margins as a hedge against overoptimism. For months the financial writers and market analysts have been saying we would incur another deficit. It is now clear—and universally conceded—that we will close the fiscal year again deeply in the red. In the last 8 years, 1955-62, final results, for a variety of reasons, varied from original budget predictions and recommendations by over \$28 billion—that much deeper than had been originally budgeted.

Jefferson's admonition is particularly applicable in this emergency:

I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared. To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our choice between economy and liberty or profusion and servitude. If we run into such debts, we must be taxed in our meat and drink, in our necessities and our comforts, in our labors and in our amusements. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people, under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy.

Mr. Speaker, but for the indefatigable labor and sound business judgment of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and others who have stood with him during his 40 years of dedicated service to the reduction of the budgets, the national debt, frightening and dangerous as it is—the national debt would be even billions and billions higher today. When the gentleman from New York, JOHN TABER, came to the House in 1923, the national debt was \$22 billion. Today it is \$302 billion—and going higher.

When JOHN TABER came to the House in 1923, the annual expenditure of the

Government was \$3 billion. Today it is \$115 billion—and going higher.

When JOHN TABER came to the House in 1923, there were 536,000 Federal employees. Today there are 2,514,000—and there will be more.

The inescapable consequences in store for us if this trend continues indefinitely are unpredictable. In this situation we are not in position to further expand the Federal establishment or undertake additional obligations beyond those absolutely essential. On the contrary it is high time we took carefully considered measures to retrench expenditures, put in motion efforts to reduce surplus activities, reduce the cost of living, and adopt a program for methodical and periodical reduction of the public debt.

[Mr. HALLECK addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

THE 2D SESSION OF THE 87TH CONGRESS

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 3 minutes.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished minority leader in his tribute to retiring Members. I want particularly to pay tribute to my Democratic colleagues who will not be with us next year. They are: Representative BURR P. HARRISON, of Virginia; Representative MERWIN COAD, of Iowa; Representative MORGAN MOULDER, of Missouri; Representative DANIEL BREWSTER, of Maryland; Representative SIDNEY YATES, of Illinois; Representative FRED MARSHALL, of Minnesota; Representative DANIEL INOUE, of Hawaii; Representative BRENT SPENCE, of Kentucky; Representative IRIS F. BLITCH, of Georgia; Representative CATHERINE NORRELL, of Arkansas; Representative CORINNE RILEY, of South Carolina; Representative GRACIE PFOST, of Idaho; Representative VICTOR ANFUSO, of New York; Representative KATHRYN GRANAHAAN, of Pennsylvania; Representative FRANK BOYKIN, of Alabama; Representative FRANK SMITH, of Mississippi; Representative FRANK KOWALSKI, of Connecticut; Representative HAROLD MCSWEEN, of Louisiana; Representative DALE ALFORD, of Arkansas; Representative JAMES FRAZIER, of Tennessee; Representative HERBERT ZELENKO, of New York; Representative JAMES C. DAVIS, of Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, the 2d session of the 87th Congress has been notable in many respects and in its waning hours I should like to comment very briefly and generally concerning those events and the great personalities which carried them forward. Although we have been constrained to spend more time in session than is usual, and at considerable sac-

rifice for many of our Members, I believe we can now lay down our burdens secure in the knowledge that we have met our legislative obligations to the best of our ability and that the record of this session bears the stamp of solid accomplishment in many vital areas, both domestic and foreign.

The House now concludes its first year of operation under the guidance of the gentleman from Massachusetts, Speaker McCORMACK, whose leadership has been ably and adroitly executed during the past 10 months. His performance during this time of stress and unprecedented challenge has been outstanding. His reputation as one of the truly great Speakers of this House is sealed with the record of this session. I extend my personal thanks to the Speaker for the many, many considerations he has shown me. I believe my appreciation also expresses the sense of the Members on both sides of the aisle.

The Speaker loves and seeks to serve with fairness and dedication every Member of the House. As the devoted leader of his party he has given skilled effort and tireless attention to the great program of President Kennedy.

The leadership is deeply in the debt of its Democratic whip, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] and his assistant whips, for the truly magnificent work they have done during this session. They have been extremely accurate in their polls on legislative matters. For outstanding and devoted assistance on so many occasions, I personally am deeply indebted to my friend and coworker, the gentleman from Louisiana, HALE BOGGS.

I can find no adequate words to give full expression to the gratitude I feel toward all the Members of the House, both Democrats and Republicans, for the many kindnesses they have shown me. Members of my own party have given me support and help of a measure far greater than I could have hoped to receive.

My Republican friends have shown me innumerable courtesies. I extend my thanks to all of them and particularly to their distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and to the very able minority whip, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]. They have been most kind and considerate to me in all personal matters and in all matters involving the efficient and orderly operation of the House. They are great Americans and I am happy to say they are my personal friends.

Without the cooperation and state-ment-ship of the minority leadership the course of this House would have been far less stable, and far less productive in the very vital areas of our national defense and foreign policy. For if we are divided by political ideology, we are united by mutual recognition of our common purpose to serve our people and our country above all else.

The Members of the House have given lavishly to this body and to the Nation, of the best of their talents, almost entirely of their time, and with superb de-

termination to meet the myriad challenges and problems which have faced them constantly during this session.

The Members of the House, its officers, and employees, all have given tireless devotion and effort during this long and arduous session. Our Parliamentarian, Lew Deshler, whose workday and workload are exceeded only by his great talents and knowledge, was ill for a few days last week but we are fortunate now to have him back among us during the closing hours of this session. Lew Deshler has no peer in his field. His services are essential to the functioning of the House. He has been a bulwark of strength not only in his capacity as the leading parliamentarian of the world but as a wise and experienced servant of this House. He has through every hour of every session been the strong, indispensable right arm of the leadership on both sides of the aisle.

I hope that the months ahead will bring opportunity for rest and relaxation for the Members and officers and employees, all of whom have worked hard and deserve a time away from their strenuous routines. Again I thank you for your friendship and your help. I wish for each and every one of you good health and good fortune, in the present and in the future.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY PRESIDENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 835

Resolved, That a committee of two Members be appointed by the House to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed their business of the session and are ready to adjourn unless the President has some further communication to make to them.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as Members on the part of the House of the committee to notify the President the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

NATIONAL FISHERIES CENTER AND AQUARIUM ADVISORY BOARD

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 5(a), Public Law 87-758, the Chair appoints as members of the National Fisheries Center and Aquarium Advisory Board the following Members on the part of the House: The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

WORK PLANS RECOMMENDED UNDER WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read by the Clerk and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

OCTOBER 11, 1962.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection

and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Public Works has approved the work plans transmitted to you which were referred to this committee. The work plans involved are:

State	Watershed	Executive Communication No.	Committee approval
Alabama	Town Creek	2289	Oct. 2, 1962
Delaware and Pennsylvania	Brandywine Creek	2424	Do.
Georgia	Tobesofkee Creek (supplemental)	2535	Do.
Kansas	Twin Caney	2424	Do.
Oklahoma	Upper Blue River	2289	Do.
Do	Cottonwood Creek	2535	Do.
Do	Delaware Creek	2535	Do.
Pennsylvania	Sandy Creek	2424	Do.
South Carolina	Thicketty Creek	2289	Do.
Texas	Salado Creek	2424	Do.
Do	Valley Creek	2424	Do.
Wyoming	Boulder Lake	2572	Do.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

(Mr. GRAY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

[Mr. GRAY'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

MATTER OF CONSCIENCE

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, in the Cuban ransom blackmail deal, it is becoming more evident that the attempt to raise moneys, foodstuffs, and medicines to be turned over to Castro to help keep him in power, could properly be described as a "Kennedy Conscience Fund" for the failure of the Bay of Pigs invasion. The following editorial from the Tampa Tribune in my district indicates that this is what that newspaper thinks, which is in support of what I have been saying:

MATTER OF CONSCIENCE

The more that leaks out about the proposed ransoming of the 1,113 Cuban invasion prisoners, the worse the deal looks for the United States.

All the signs suggest that the ransom is not only approved by President Kennedy but that most of the food, medicine, and money handed over to Fidel Castro will come from American taxpayers. Nobody knows what the final agreement may call for but Castro originally demanded \$62 million; if he knows that the President is behind the negotiations, he is not likely to settle for less.

And Castro can hardly fail to know.

The New York World-Telegram said yesterday that the American negotiator, New York lawyer James B. Donovan, was given the assignment last June by none other than Attorney General Robert Kennedy.

An earlier tipoff came in a column by Joseph Alsop, published on this page Tuesday. Alsop, who is close to the Kennedys, said in effect that the President had decided to ransom the prisoners as a matter of conscience, because he was responsible for the bungled invasion.

A further clue is the fact that the committee of Cuban exiles which for some months has been attempting to raise the ransom money by private donation has had little success. The only fairy godmother with the equivalent of \$60 million to drop in

the pot is the Federal Government. The money presumably could be taken from the funds of the Central Intelligence Agency, which makes no public accounting of its spending.

Now, we have deep sympathy for the 1,113 captives and all the thousands of less-publicized prisoners rotting in Castro's jails. We also can appreciate President Kennedy's lacerations of conscience, from the nagging knowledge that his denial of air support wrecked the invasion and caused the capture of most of the little army of freedom fighters.

But there are more than the welfare of prisoners and the mental comfort of the President to consider.

There are, for example, the national honor and the campaign to free Cuba from communism.

Our prestige suffered enough from the Bay of Pigs defeat, when the world's mightiest nation permitted itself to be humiliated by a Red dwarf. What will Latin America and the rest of the world think of our now buying back the prisoners—instead of rescuing them at gunpoint?

Even worse, perhaps, in the world's view will be the inconsistency of threatening to penalize Allied countries whose ships carry cargoes to Cuba at the very time our Government is preparing to ship to Castro invaluable supplies of food and medicine. Who can understand such a violent contradiction in declared policy?

We are reminded of President Kennedy's stirring words in announcing the failure of the invasion in April 1961. Speaking sternly of the necessity for resolute action to maintain freedom in this hemisphere, he said "the complacent, the self-indulgent, the soft societies will be swept away with the debris of history."

Ransoming the prisoners, we submit, is the course of softness. Unless the President begins to meet the Cuban problem with some of the promised toughness of spirit, more of free Latin America will become debris on the Red tide. And Mr. Kennedy then will have on his conscience not 1,113 prisoners but millions.

UNANIMOUS OPPOSITION EXPRESSED TO BLACKMAIL RANSOM PROPOSALS BY CASTRO TO FREE CUBAN PRISONERS

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, with the negotiations of James Donovan with Castro for the payment of

Franciscan Fathers taught the Indians to build elaborate aqueducts, irrigation ditches and mills. Here is where the Viceroy of Mexico brought Canary Islanders to live and where the Governor's palace was later erected. Over half a century before the cornerstone of this Capitol was laid the cornerstone of our San Fernando Cathedral was laid.

San Antonio became the meeting point of the Spanish-speaking and the English-speaking cultures on the American continents. It continues to have that distinction. But our city is not composed of only English and Spanish. To this city, which was built hundreds of miles beyond the then existing frontier of the United States, there came also the Germans, the French, and the Irish. And from La Villita of the Spanish, Germantown of the Germans, Military Plaza of the Americans, and the Irish flats of the Irish, there has truly been composed, in every sense of that tranquil word, a great and cosmopolitan city around which has grown the ninth most populated congressional district in the United States.

I speak here for San Antonio and the county of Bexar. I do it proudly. There is much for which to be proud that is not told in terms of history, but rather in those terms by which we take the measure of a city.

There is much I could tell you of our industries, our natural resources, our universities, our schools, our hospitals, our research foundations, our agricultural and livestock diversity, our rapidly growing population, our parks, our museums, our art centers, our multiplicity of tourist attractions, our recreational facilities, our trade and commerce and our ready access to Mexico and to the hills and plains of Texas.

Statistics on all these might burden you, for you have your own case to make for your own districts. However, the U.S. Congress has obviously thought well of San Antonio for many, many decades. If it were not so, the Congress would not have placed there so many facilities important to our Nation.

You have known of San Antonio as the home of many important defense installations: Fort Sam Houston, headquarters of the 4th Army, Brooke Army Medical Center, Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio Air Material Area, the Continental Division of the Military Air Transport Service, Lackland Air Force Base, Kelly Air Field, and others.

Past Congresses have known of San Antonio as a good place with good people—a place to which you can entrust the welfare of things important to the Nation and a place to which anyone can go to visit or to live with ease and appreciation.

(Mr. GONZALEZ at the request of Mr. Boggs) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. DANIELS at the request of Mr. Boggs) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. DANIELS' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

PERSONAL STATEMENT

(Mr. WHITENER at the request of Mr. Boggs) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, responding to the personal and urgent request of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, I returned to Washington today to be present for the meeting of the House of Representatives.

I had hoped to be here when the call of the House was made at 12, but due to transportation difficulties I did not arrive in time to answer the rollcall.

Although I was not able to have my name recorded as present, I wish to have the RECORD show my presence soon thereafter.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

(Mr. HEMPHILL at the request of Mr. Boggs) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, this morning early I received a message from our beloved Speaker of the House asking that I return to Washington for today's session.

I immediately made my plans to return but transportation difficulties delayed my arrival and I did not arrive in the Chamber until the rollcall had been completed. I regret this very much, but I do want the RECORD to show my presence here for the remainder of today's program.

THE MAJORITY WHIP

(Mr. BOGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to reply to the very gracious remarks made by my distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT]. I have had in this second session of this Congress the responsibility of majority whip. Mr. Speaker, it has been a great pleasure and an honor to work with you and the majority leader of this body.

The name "whip," in my opinion, is a misnomer because what we are trying to do is work with the Members of the House on both sides of the aisle, understand their problems and understand and recognize the fact that all of them represent great districts in this magnificent country of ours.

Mr. Speaker, it has been an honor and a privilege for me to work with you, with the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], and my colleagues on the Republican side.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 293 today I was unavoidably detained. I should like the RECORD to show that had I been here I would have voted "yea."

REDEEMABLE GROUND RENTS

(Mr. MILLS at the request of Mr. Boggs) was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the Members of the House the bill, H.R. 8754, introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from Maryland, the Honorable SAM FRIEDEL. This bill has passed the House but no action has been taken on it by the other body.

The problem involved has to do with the treatment of redeemable ground rents, a common arrangement in Maryland. The bill would treat the buyer of property subject to a redeemable ground rent, for tax purposes, as having bought the land. This would make him eligible for the interest deduction and it would treat the seller as having received the current value of the ground rent.

This is a problem that has been unsettled for several years. It is my hope that legislation similar to H.R. 8754 as it passed the House this year can be enacted by Congress early next year. If it can be enacted promptly we will be able to make its application to homeowners retroactive. The application to sellers would, of course, be prospective.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS ACT OF 1959

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 10539) to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to provide additional choice of health benefits plans, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will explain the legislation. It is a very important piece of legislation, and I want the House to know that it has the support of many of us on our side of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I think it is desirable legislation and ought to pass.

(Mr. OLSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, this legislation will correct an inequitable situation that has developed since enactment of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act in 1959—and which was not and could not be foreseen at that time—with regard to participation in the program by employee organizations.

In establishing the Federal employees health benefits program, the Congress gave recognition to the fact that a num-

October 13

ber, of employee organizations had already arranged group health insurance plans for their members in the absence of a Federal program. Specific provisions were, therefore, made in the law for participation in the program by these organizations in order to avoid the hardships and inequities that might arise if membership in these organizations might be drained off into a separate Federal program. Among the requirements that had to be met by organizations' plans was that they had been in operation on July 1, 1959, and that they apply for approval as carriers before December 31, 1959.

The law, as written, did serve the purpose of affording protection to those employee organizations who already had health benefit plans and who were approved as carriers. There is no evidence that any of them have lost membership.

However, subsequent developments have tended to impose undue hardships on those employee organizations who had no plan of their own or who may not have sought approval as a carrier. There is evidence to the effect that these organizations are losing membership to the organizations who do have health benefit plans.

In testifying before our committee, the national president of the National Association of Post Office Mail Handlers, Watchmen, Messengers, and Group Leaders reported that his organization is losing members in appreciable numbers, mainly because the organization has no health benefits plan. The local union of this organization in New York City has lost over 1,000 in the past 2 years. These employees are being attracted into other organizations which are able to offer a health benefit plan as a recruitment incentive.

The health benefits program was intended, as our committee's original report on the legislation indicated, to facilitate and strengthen the administration of the activities of the Government generally and to improve personnel administration in the Government. It was definitely not intended to be a recruitment aid or incentive for employee organization membership campaigns. It was certainly not the intent of Congress in enacting the legislation to place any employee organization in an unfair position in relation to any other organization.

The remedy for this situation lies in the enactment of H.R. 10539. It will, in effect, "open up" the program for a short period of time—to the end of this year—to any employee organization who may now wish to apply for approval as a carrier. It will eliminate the requirement that employee organization plans must have been in operation on July 1, 1959, and it will permit any organization to apply for approval up to December 31, 1962.

My committee is agreed that, regardless of other considerations, this is the only fair course that can be taken at this time. It further wishes to emphasize that this action should not set a precedent for similar action in the future. This so-called open season will exist for only this one short period of

time and organizations desiring to apply for approval as carriers will only have this opportunity to do so.

It is expected that enactment of this legislation will entail only a nominal increase in certain administrative expenses.

Mr. Speaker, I emphasize again that this legislation seeks only to correct an inequity that has developed and which could not be foreseen when the Federal Employee Benefits Act was enacted. I sincerely urge the prompt enactment of H.R. 10539.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 2(1) of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 710; 5 U.S.C. 3001(1)) is amended by striking out "1959" and inserting in lieu thereof "1962".

(b) Section 4(3) of such Act (73 Stat. 711; 5 U.S.C. 3003(3)) is amended by striking out "and which on July 1, 1959, provided health benefits to members of the organization".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KIM CHONG KOO

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3215) for the relief of Kim Chong Koo.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kim Chong Koo may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the said Act and a petition may be filed by the Reverend and Mrs. Kenneth J. Mitchell, citizens of the United States, in behalf of the said Kim Chong Koo pursuant to section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RANSOM OF CUBAN PRISONERS—OR AID TO CASTRO AND COMMUNISM—OR CASTRO'S BLACKMAIL ATTEMPT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, it appears we are adjourning barely before

the frost is on the pumpkin, as a matter of fact, just barely before the frost is on the pumpkin in northern Florida. However, there is substantial unfinished business before this Congress.

One item to which this Congress should have given consideration was the series of resolutions opposing the Cuban ransom deal which I introduced which would have had the effect, first, House Concurrent Resolution 479, May 31, 1962, of reversing the ruling of the Internal Revenue Service which has finally come properly to light in the morning papers, which declares that the ransoming of prisoners is "a charitable purpose." The ransoming of Cuban prisoners is a charitable purpose, according to the Treasury Department. Under the internal revenue laws, therefore, anyone making contributions to the Cuban Prisoner Committee can get tax deductions, so by the back door the taxpayers, as the result of loss of revenue to the Treasury, are paying a part of the bill.

The second resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 322, May 1961, would have vetoed in the first instance the \$20 million tractor-for-prisoner blackmail proposal and in the second instance House Concurrent Resolution 459, April 11, 1962, the \$62 million for prisoners blackmail proposed by Fidel Castro. This proposal of ransom and of indemnity—I think to put the thing in proper focus it is important to point out that Fidel Castro from the beginning has been demanding indemnity, and he has been demanding that this country pay to his country for damages done by the abortive invasion in the Bay of Pigs that failed.

There has never been any doubt in his mind what the money would be for—indemnity or ransom.

I was utterly amazed and I might say shocked a few months ago when I received from the Internal Revenue Department when I inquired, which resulted from my introduction of House Concurrent Resolution 459 which would have abrogated the preliminary regulation that provides that money contributed to the Cuban Prisoner Committee would be tax deductible, that the Secretary of the Treasury, Douglas Dillon, in his letter to me in April based the decision of the Internal Revenue Service on this theory, and can you imagine such a theory:

Throughout history the redemption of prisoners has been regarded as a charitable activity.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I am very interested in what the gentleman is saying, and his interest in this whole matter. I hope the gentleman will expand on and explain a bit more the background of the quotation that he has just given to us.

Mr. CRAMER. I would be delighted to do so. Can you imagine that theory? I wrote the Secretary and challenged him to cite examples. Quoting from Secretary Dillon's letter on the theory as

1962

would open up if trained and willing people were available to fill them? The help-wanted ads which appear in our newspapers tell only a part of the story. Many employers, knowing that the workers they seek are not available, do not even bother to advertise for them or to train them.

I have estimated that in the field of health alone, 900,000 more persons could be employed as doctors, dentists, nurses, nurses' aids, laboratory technicians, orderlies, physical therapists—if only qualified people were available.

To a large extent the same situation applies in the field of education. Many areas of the country are desperately short of teachers, teachers' aids, and other school personnel. Furthermore, it is almost impossible to find competent, fully qualified secretaries. There is also a severe shortage of automobile mechanics, tailors, sales clerks, shoe repairers, office workers, social and welfare workers, and scientific and technical subprofessional personnel, even newspaper reporters. The list could go on and on.

There is no magic cure-all to our employment problem. But I believe that to meet the challenge of technology, we must launch a vast program to upgrade the skills of our people so that they can fill the many new jobs being created in our highly developed and increasingly service-oriented society and leave their old jobs to be filled by others, possibly unemployed persons with lesser skills.

Training and retraining of workers in new skills and occupations requires close cooperation among individuals, corporations, labor unions, and Federal, State, and local governments. But the key to the success of any retraining program is the individual energetic and ambitious enough to try to improve his skills or education.

The greatest waste in our society is the person capable of doing a job requiring a higher skill who will not train himself to handle that skill but who, instead, lazes along in a job which is too easy for him. Such a person robs himself as well as the person who does not have the talent to fill the more demanding job but who could adequately handle the less demanding one. Furthermore, he lets down his society.

Our training and retraining effort must cover the entire spectrum of skills. People ask me how the unemployed laborer can be trained as an electronics computer technician. The answer is that he won't be. The possessor of the lowest skill will not be the one trained for the newly emerging job demanding the higher skill. The new job will be filled by a worker who already is highly skilled and who can easily upgrade his skill, and so on down the line.

Another question often asked is, Training for what? It is a key question. We shall defeat our purpose if we train men and women in outmoded skills and dying occupations. Our training must be done with an eye to the future.

One of the most efficient ways of developing the right skills is through inplant training within a corporation. Some of the most encouraging developments in company training are the farsighted programs which train employees to take jobs that do not yet exist while preparing to introduce new machinery and techniques that will eliminate the old jobs.

But the problem cannot be solved by private effort if government does not help to maintain the proper economic climate, and, might I add, if our churches and character building institutions do not help to preserve the proper human attitudes. The Federal Government has a vital role to play. A slow start has been made. The recently enacted Manpower Training and Development Act can become a major Federal effort in this field. I am proud to say that this act is largely mod-

eled along the lines of the program offered by Republicans in the House after conducting a study, which I had the privilege to organize and direct, into the problems of employment in our dynamic economy. That study, which the press called operation employment, was conducted by 50 House Republicans to which 25 university specialists contributed basic research papers. It was a highly useful study, and I hope we can go into the problem further next year. I have a few copies of the conclusions and recommendations we reached, which I would like to leave with you.

The manpower retraining program, when in full swing, will provide new skills for about 20 percent of those now unemployed. However, if it hits at frictional unemployment in a timely fashion, we will prevent it from freezing into structural unemployment ever again, as happened because of our inattention to the coal mining areas. The encouragement of private businesses to continue and to improve their training and retraining programs is a must. Furthermore, more remains to be done at the Federal level and at all levels of Government to encourage individuals to upgrade their skills. Let me cite a few examples of what the Federal Government can do, and in some instances stop doing, to create this climate or encouragement. I urge your support of these proposals.

I am convinced that men and women who want to increase their education or develop skills should be permitted to deduct such expenses from their income for Federal income tax purposes. At present, they can do so only if the training or education is required to hold their present job. A bill which I have introduced in the House, H.R. 9194, would permit such deductions when incurred in order to move into a new and better job. This is essential in encouraging the upgrading process.

Another area where action is needed is in those States which deny unemployment insurance to persons undergoing retraining. Here again, the law works directly contrary to the public interest. It discourages training when it should be encouraged. But some progress is being made. In 1960, only six States permitted an individual to receive unemployment compensation while undergoing training. Today 20 States permit it. All States should permit it, yes, even demand it of an unemployed person lacking a skill in demand.

The U.S. Department of Labor "Directory of Skills" must be brought up to date. This is a vital first step in preparing our growing work force for the jobs of tomorrow. Many skills in demand are so new we don't even have names for them.

The U.S. Employment Service must be strengthened so that it can be effective in assisting the States, local communities and private business in counseling, placing and relocating workers.

Furthermore, the Department of Labor must begin the formidable task of collecting information on job vacancies on a national scale, just as it regularly collects statistics on our unemployment. With job vacancy information at hand, the U.S. Employment Service could better perform its mission of bringing together the jobless man and the manless job.

The ultimate usefulness of our efforts to identify job vacancies and to upgrade the skills of our workers will be crippled if we fail to encourage greater voluntary mobility of the labor force. We must make it easier for people to move to areas where job opportunities exist.

The mobility of workers is reduced by a number of factors. For example, the non-transferability of pension, seniority and other job rights may tie a worker to a particular job. Cooperation between labor and management can help to remove some of these barriers to mobility.

There are some things that the Federal Government can do to encourage mobility. I have introduced a bill in the House which would make a worker's home for tax purposes his place of residence rather than his place of employment. This simple amendment to update our archaic tax law would remove the tax penalty which workers suffer when they leave their place of residence for a nonpermanent assignment, in another place, or when they follow their job to its new location and have difficulty selling their home and moving their family with them.

These proposals which I have put forward are some of the examples of the free enterprise approach to the problem. I think it is an approach which would serve us well if only we gave it a chance.

Another aspect of our unemployment problem deserves some special attention. Many of our young people, particularly the high school dropout, our Negro citizens, and workers over 45 suffer severely from discrimination as well as from the handicap of having only minimal skills. This discrimination against large numbers of our citizens is both economically and morally wrong.

The problem of the high school dropout has received more and more attention in recent years, and with good reason. Unless we take vigorous action to reduce the dropout rate among high school students, more than 30 percent of new workers entering the labor force in the 1960's—or roughly 7.5 million youngsters—will not have completed high school. Of these, over 2.5 million will not even have completed grade school. This is a staggering social problem with potentially explosive consequences.

Our first objective must be to motivate these youngsters to remain in school. But while in school, they must receive sound vocational guidance and training. Furthermore, State and local employment services must put special emphasis on the problem of finding jobs for these young people.

The U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare must do a complete overhaul and updating job of Federal vocational education. HEW and the Department of Labor must start coordinating instead of competing in these two fields—vocational education and apprenticeship training. All of this should be coordinated with the vocational education programs conducted by our military establishment. Today the military establishment is the largest operator of vocational education.

Many of the workers over 45 are jobless because employers are prejudiced against older workers for various reasons or because they believe they cannot be trained to the new skills. This belief is largely without foundation. Older workers learn more slowly, but once trained they outperform the younger men. The maturity and experience of our older workers is a precious national asset and must not be wasted.

The prejudice against rehabilitated or habilitated disabled workers must be overcome. Rehabilitation of a disabled person is the most human and economically sensible program we have in our society. The disabled person is a great potential for filling the new jobs that our society so badly needs to have filled.

The discrimination suffered by our Negro citizens is well known to this group. You know, as do I, that much remains to be done by certain unions, some companies and even the Government to eliminate the discrimination that bars Negroes from many of the better jobs. I hope your union will continue to fight vigorously against unfair discrimination in employment and keep those of us in Congress who are carrying on the battle there. In addition, Negro workers, by and large, are concentrated in the less skilled occupations. Census figures show that 75 percent of the Negroes are in five major unskilled and semiskilled occu-

pational categories. Since these groups are most seriously affected by layoffs during recessions and by technological changes, Negroes are disproportionately represented among the unemployed.

Right now there is considerably more that the Federal Government can do to attack the problem of racial discrimination in employment. For example, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People has asked the Department of Labor to withhold Federal funds from State employment services that discriminate against Negroes and to stop discrimination in the hiring of Negroes on construction work done for the Government by private contractors. Much remains to be done in eliminating racial exclusion from construction apprenticeship programs. I have worked with the NAACP to achieve this reform, a continuing fight. Many cities haven't even started reforming the apprenticeship program. Even in my own city of St. Louis, one of the first test cities, the battle has not yet been fully won, even though the Department of Labor is offering its assistance.

Recently, I have seen suggestions in the press that unless our chronic unemployment is solved soon, we will have to seek an answer in heavier and heavier doses of Federal spending. What a negative, unanalytical, tired and outworn approach that is. I say unless the crying need for trained people to man our schools, our laboratories, our health institutions, our service and distributive industries is filled we are going to eliminate economic growth. Then we will become a tired, stagnant economy going no place where a skill learned as a youth remains a skill still in demand at age 65.

I believe in the free enterprise market economy. With imagination and hard thought, I am certain we can get our people to fill the jobs going begging without relying on the crutch of Federal spending or new encroachments by the Central Government on the freedoms of individuals, businesses and unions. This approach will not solve the problem arising from long-term changes in the nature and location of jobs. In fact, by delaying the search for a genuine solution, it could well make the problem worse.

In complete honesty, we have to recognize that there are no easy or pat solutions to our employment problem. But I am certain of one thing—that the answers of the prewar depressions, if indeed they ever were true answers, are not sufficient for the questions which trouble us today. All of us must keep our minds open to new and workable ideas. We are the first society in history to emerge into an economic system based upon plenty, not upon scarcity. We cannot put this new wine into old bottles. Our challenge is one of the future, not of dead ghosts of the past.

THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

(Mr. LINDSAY (at the request of Mr. PINNIE) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, in this second year of the Alliance for Progress, it has become apparent that the effectiveness of the Organization of American States will be an important factor in its success or failure. I want to take a moment to speak about that organization because of some severe criticism which has been directed at it lately.

There is no doubt that a vigorous, effective OAS could significantly contribute to speeding the economic and social development of the hemisphere. From the U.S. point of view, its potential value is inestimable. Even though we are sincerely devoted to the task of improving the social and economic conditions of

the hemisphere, many of our neighbors of the south view our actions with great circumspection. The OAS, however, can speak to Latin America with true impartiality; the voice of the OAS is the voice of Latin America itself. It can say and do things which we in the United States cannot do except at a great disadvantage. Expert advice and prodding for reform, if it comes from a respected, effective OAS, will not arouse the irrational reactions and resentment as would similar advice from a U.S. Government agency. In short, some very practical and pragmatic reasons exist why the OAS can be a most instrumental tool if we wish to hasten the programs for the development of the hemisphere.

From all indications, reports in the leading newspapers in the country and reports which I have personally received at my desk, the OAS is faltering. I am not, at this time, addressing myself to the political role of the organization in the case of Cuba. That is another question. My concern in this case relates solely to the activities of the organization in the field of economic development and technical aid. This is, after all, the core of the task before us. I fully appreciate that the OAS has a long history in inter-American affairs, and that some of its problems result from those deep roots back to a period when it did not have very much to do and functioned accordingly. Today, however, with the unfolding of the Alliance for Progress, its machinery must be adapted to greatly demanding tasks. This calls for leadership and it appears that the administration has not provided that leadership.

There is a great need for the administration to make a strong effort to discover what troubles this organization and what can be done about it. We can not point a finger at the Latin American nations for the ineffectuality of the organization when we ourselves have been equally guilty in disregarding its potentiality. Our diplomatic representation to the Organization does not indicate that we place great importance in the role that it must play in the hemisphere. And it will certainly never assume that role in economic development and technical assistance unless we, who bear the greatest responsibilities, begin to pay closer attention to it.

In this respect, to date, the OAS has been largely ineffectual in its efforts. There is lack of coordination, costly duplication and delay; followthrough in its work is poor; studies into which great amounts of technical and expert effort have been poured are filed away or go unheeded; highly paid experts are unable to put all their talents to work because of the lack of imaginative leadership; competition and jockeying for personal advantage within the organization become more and more burdensome daily. Granted that all large organizations suffer a measure of these woes; but at least, in other organizations, a code of accomplishment exists along with all the personal politics and, when all is said and done, something is accomplished. In the OAS that code of accomplishment seems to have been lost.

This is all the more puzzling and disheartening when one looks at the potential of the men responsible for directing the Organization. It is true that Secretary General Mora has been tagged with some harsh criticism recently, and certainly his record has not been one to generate spontaneous praise. But the Secretary General and some of the people around him are men who have risen to exacting tasks before; their careers indicate a potential capability which, for some reason, is presently paralyzed. The question we must ask, and demand an answer, is what has happened? Why aren't these men living up to the needs of the Organization and the hemisphere? Why are no imaginative ideas coming forth out of the offices of the OAS? Why is not the Organization taking advantage of its well-established impartial role to assert leadership in many of the administrative needs of the Alliance and to press for technical reform?

I think we deserve some answers to these questions. I think we would do well to know why the administration does not make a more determined effort to eliminate the impediments to the effective functioning of this organization. After all, the people who staff the OAS are the same people with whom we must deal in the governments of the Latin American countries. If we cannot do the job here, with people who are right on our front doorstep, and convince them to undertake the vigorous action necessary, what hope is there that we will ever be able to do a similar job with their compatriots in the governments of the American States that are thousands of miles away?

More important, the Alliance, if it is to succeed, needs some organization that will not act as a focus to crystallize the energies of the peoples of the hemisphere and serve as a focal point for the aspirations of 200 million Latin Americans—one that will, in the words of Ambassador Roberto Campos, of Brazil, reprinted on the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD only a few weeks ago, established a mystique or crusade atmosphere to the Alliance. No U.S. Government or citizen is able to do that. An organization manned and inspired by Latin Americans might.

Although some people argue for organizing a separate entity for this purpose, I am not at all sure that when one organization is not functioning adequately, creating a new one is any answer. We presently have an elaborate inter-American organization which could, if functioning properly, do the job. It is worth the try. If the U.S. Government cannot, with serious and intense efforts, forge the OAS into a vigorous, purposeful organization, I fear it does not augur well for the future of the Alliance for Progress as a dynamic force to counter the threat of communism in the hemisphere.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

(Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (at the request of Mr. PINNIE) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

with much needed dollars, foodstuffs, and medicines, all of which he can trade off for more war materiel to be used against the United States of America and the freedom-loving countries of this hemisphere, and which he can use to build up communism in other countries in this hemisphere. That is what is wrong with this whole deal.

I hope that puts it in focus. Now, where are we? As of now we find Mr. Donovan back in Miami. Negotiations have been going on for months. I understand the Ransom Committee started in April and Donovan interceded in early August 1962.

The American people have not been told this. The American people are not told even now what the deal is. The American people have not been advised. The American people do not know what authority Mr. Donovan has to negotiate in regard to contributions by this Nation or its people to this ransom deal.

When I inquired of the State Department about it they admitted that they were doing "contingency planning." That is a good gobbledygook term, is it not? "Contingency planning" in the event that a request came from Mr. Donovan and the committee for contributions on the part of the United States.

I asked the State Department's Mr. Robert A. Hurwitch, Assistant Secretary of State, about this "contingency planning," "What authority do you have to spend 5 cents in paying ransom to an enemy, payment by the Government of the United States to Fidel Castro?" I have never knowingly and intentionally voted a nickel that could be used by the Government of the United States as payment to an enemy government, to Castro or communism.

He said in that respect that that, too, is part of the "contingency planning" to determine where moneys or foodstuffs or other matters of value are that could be made available to the committee. Is there any doubt that it is being given consideration?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. May I say to the gentleman from Florida in regard to the taxpayer's funds being used for a contingency of that kind that as a member of the subcommittee making appropriations for the State Department I would say there is no money that has been appropriated for that purpose. They never have submitted any request for money for that purpose.

As one member of the committee I shall inquire next year whether any has been used, and if it has, we will bring it to the attention of the House. But I would serve notice on the State Department now that here is no money that has been appropriated by our committee for that purpose. I would think they would be making a great mistake if they used funds appropriated for other purposes for any such purpose as the gentleman has now referred to.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman. I agree this should be the case. I think the gentleman is referring like-

wise to the Central Intelligence Agency. I am confident no one in this body has voted for those appropriations thinking they could be used for that purpose.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I want to commend the gentleman from Florida for the campaign he has carried on in the last several days on this issue and say to him I thoroughly agree that not one dime of the American taxpayers should be spent for the liberation of the Cuban prisoners without the express authorization of Congress. This would be, it seems to me, the worst kind of tribute paid to Fidel Castro. I am sure the gentleman knows and every Member of the House knows that the money thus expended would be paid over eventually to the Russians.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman. He put his finger exactly on the problem. I go further and say that dollars collected by the voluntary ransom committee likewise gives Castro just as much support and are of just as much value to him. That, too, should not be permitted.

I started to discuss briefly these negotiations. Look where the United States of America now is. We find that Mr. Donovan is back in Miami probably conferring with Mr. Greenfield, a representative of the State Department in project X. All this mystery, with no information made available to the American public. We find Mr. Donovan suggesting that there is a hitch in the negotiations. I assume the hitch is, and my best information is that the hitch is that Mr. Castro, wanting to get as much advantage as he can out of this propagandawise—and do not think he is the only one behind this. Do not think Khrushchev is not giving him advice on how to get the most propaganda advantage out of this. They are going to drag it along a little while, let the whole world know that the United States of America is willing to get on its knees to Fidel Castro, the puppet of Red China and Russia in Cuba.

So they are upping the ante—dragging on the negotiations—ask for more of everything—more money, more foodstuffs, more medicine, additional guarantees, supply new lists that Castro wants filled, change the ground rules. How long is this humiliating experience going on? He must have gotten word from Khrushchev. He must have gotten word from Mao Tse-tung that he is making points in the world propagandawise—keep it up, keep the United States of America on its knees, let the world know Mr. Donovan who has authority to negotiate from the U.S. Government that he is on his knees to Fidel Castro, Khrushchev and Mao must be saying. The asininity of this thing. How did we ever get ourselves in such a position is hardly understandable to me.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I have been interested to know how Mr. Donovan gets into the picture and what interest he has in this business. Who is financing him? What authority has he been delegated by the U.S. Government? Why do we have highly paid diplomats by the score? Are they unable to carry on negotiations, if negotiations should be carried on? Is this administration saying it is necessary to find someone from outside of the Government to carry on these negotiations? I do not understand the situation at all.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman is asking many questions that, I am sure, are in the minds of the American people as well as people throughout the world. This man has no portfolio. This man has no Senate confirmation. This man has not put his credentials before the American people for examination. This man is a private citizen.

I always felt the Logan Act prevented a citizen of the United States from dealing with foreign countries, even a friendly country let alone an enemy. So the only way that he could be negotiating without violating the law would be if he had "the authority of the United States" to do so. So we can only assume that he does have, but I hasten to add he should never have gotten that kind of permission from me. So we are being forced now to get down on our knees and crawl before Castro and the Communists and to accede to the indemnity demands resulting from this abortive invasion failure and to accede to the demands for ransom of a bearded, power hungry madman, Fidel Castro, who is threatening the security of this entire hemisphere. That gives the Communists a beachhead in this hemisphere the likes of which they never had in the history of communism. Now they want us to crawl even more. It is time to put a stop to it.

I wrote for consideration of my resolution calling for an end to this humiliation and aid to Castro. This is some of the unresolved business of this session. The request follows:

OCTOBER 11, 1962.

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman, the Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am deeply disturbed by reports that the President, through Mr. Donovan, is negotiating to bargain away American dollars and/or foodstuffs to Communist Castro who recently, in a strong resolution passed by the House, was declared to be an enemy of the U.S. Government, and it appears from the latest news reports that there are proposals being made to pay him in dollars from CIA funds.

This is about the greatest abuse of Presidential discretion as I can remember in the history of this country because I, as a Member of Congress, have at no time, knowingly or intentionally, ever voted for any funds, CIA or in any other authorization or appropriation bill, that would permit the President to spend taxpayers' money to pay off ransom and indemnity demands, to give into blackmail threats by an enemy government and, in particular, Fidel Castro.

As you know, I have pending House Concurrent Resolution 459, which provides: "That it is the sense of Congress that this Government oppose the trading of dollars for humans as proposed by the Communist government of Cuba and request the President

to withhold any further Executive approval of such commerce or trade with the enemy, to refuse to permit the issuance of visas to visitors to Cuba for purposes of negotiation, to refuse to permit shipment or payment of such dollars to Cuba from the United States, and to refuse to permit gifts and contributions made for such a trade to be deducted for income tax purposes."

In view of the emergency nature of this situation, and the obvious public indignation against it, as evidenced in the tractor deal which was finally disallowed by the President, and this obviously being contrary to the basic policy established by Congress itself just a few weeks ago in the Cuban resolution, I am asking for immediate hearings by your committee to consider this entire matter and my resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 459.

The people are entitled to know all the facts and I am confident that the Congress of the United States does not want to be a party to the appropriation of money or foodstuffs to be turned over to Fidel Castro. America demands that Castro and communism in this hemisphere be defeated—not supported.

If the Congress does not stop this unwholesome, degrading, and humiliating blackmail deal, the prestige of the United States will be forever irreparably harmed. I am extremely sympathetic to the Bay of Pigs invasion forces held in prison but I call your attention to the fact that, according to the Department of State, American prisoners are being held in Cuba, as well as in North Korea and in Red China, and no effort is being made for their release because of our strong policy against the ransoming of prisoners. Likewise, all of Cuba is a prison under Castro, let alone the hundreds of thousands who are known to be in jail, and our efforts should be to help the Cuban refugees free their entire country rather than put that date off indefinitely by supporting Castro and his Communist regime to the tune of \$60 million. This deal is an American surrender of principles and appeasement of communism.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

WILLIAM C. CRAMER.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., May 28, 1962.

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CRAMER: This is in response to your letters of April 25, 1962, to the President and to me, about the deductibility of contributions to the Cuban Families Committee for the Liberation of Prisoners of War, Inc.

Our records show that the committee filed an application in August 1961, with the Internal Revenue Service requesting exemption from income tax as an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. The committee also requested a determination that contributions made to it would be deductible by the donors in accordance with section 170 of the code.

Early in October, in amplification of its request, the committee informed the Internal Revenue Service that it hoped to negotiate the release of prisoners by the Castro regime in exchange for tractors. This related back to the earlier Castro demands, and at no time from the filing of the original application to the tentative granting of the exemption on December 6, was there prior knowledge, as your letter suggests, of any new Castro prisoner trade offer.

Section 501(c)(3) provides that corporations and foundations which are "organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific . . . (and) educational purposes" shall be exempt from taxation. Contributions to organizations which enjoy exempt status under section 501(c)(3) are

deductible under the provisions of code section 170. The application and supplemental evidence submitted by the committee indicate that its primary purpose, on which its entitlement to exemption depends, is the liberation, relief and rehabilitation of the prisoners now being held in Cuba. Throughout history the redemption of prisoners has been regarded as a charitable activity. Similarly, it has frequently been recognized that the relief and rehabilitation of persons in distress is charitable.

Since the purposes for which the committee was formed fall within the exemption provisions of the code, the organization was tentatively granted exemption by the Service in a letter ruling dated December 6, 1961. The letter states that if the committee is operated in accordance with its stated purposes and in the manner indicated by the evidence submitted, it will be entitled to exemption from Federal income tax and contributions received by it will be tax deductible. Before the issuance of the December 6 ruling letter, we were advised by the Justice Department that the activities of the committee would not entail any violation of the Logan Act. Also, we were informed by the State Department that there were no objections to the issuance of a favorable ruling from a foreign policy point of view.

You have requested that the ruling issued to the committee be rescinded. However, we believe that under a proper construction of the applicable provisions of the Internal Revenue Code and on the basis of the facts submitted to us, the committee is entitled to exempt status. Therefore, we can see no appropriate legal basis for the revocation of the tentative ruling issued to the organization.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. On October 6 the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] obtained unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes at the appropriate time on the last day of the session. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I have just taken advantage of that leave and have introduced that material at the close of my remarks following the last bill.

(Mr. GALLAGHER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GALLAGHER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. VANIK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. VANIK'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. VANIK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. VANIK'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. VANIK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. VANIK'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

BRIEF SUMMARY OF MAJOR LEGISLATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF 87TH CONGRESS

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to give the House a brief summary of the major legislative accomplishments of the 87th Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks, I will insert in the Appendix of the Record at a later date a more detailed statement.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, the work of this Congress will be applauded wherever freedom finds voice.

In both sessions of this historic Congress, 1961 and 1962, President Kennedy has seen enacted into law an unusually high percentage of his recommendations. This great body of forward-looking legislation sets the foundations for a new decade of peace, progress, and prosperity in the challenging 1960's.

Two illustrious names in American history have guided these sessions in the House—the revered Sam Rayburn, of Texas, in the first session, and the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, in the second. We owe a public tribute to these great architects of effective self-government.

By building impregnable military security we have renewed and revitalized the constructive forces of growth and progress everywhere in the free world.

And our own internal security has been strengthened and buttressed by new legislation to punish espionage, subversion, and betrayal at home.

The world around, the whole structure of freedom commands new authority, dignity, and power.

America faces the future with unblinking confidence, for everywhere the evil powers of destruction and moral decay are in check before the awesome might of freedom under God.

Looking back 20 months to the opening days of the 87th Congress, in January 1961, the Nation now sees clearly that our legislative program has been successful on two fronts—a broad offense against Communist aggression and subversion around the world, and a daring new offensive against distress, disaster, unemployment, and economic dislocation at home.

No boast is hinted that all of our challenging problems of national development have been solved. But we have recorded an inspiring effort to advance the central aspirations of our times—world peace, national security, and solid economic growth in a beckoning climate of justice and human dignity.

Throughout these 2 years, we have hammered out on the anvil of free debate in the Halls of Congress virtually all of the great issues and problems of our day.

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A7679

are thoroughly checked, both from the standpoint of economic feasibility and technical soundness. They are carefully examined to determine their legal sufficiency. The proposed loan to Red Rivers ECC has passed all of these tests and on the basis of our studies will make possible savings of over \$3 million in wholesale power costs to the cooperative systems to be served during the initial 10-year period of plant operation. The approval was not lightly given and its withdrawal would be both unwarranted and unreasonable on the basis suggested in your letter.

The position of the Rural Electrification Administration with respect to the custody of engineering and economic data submitted by applicants in support of their loan requests has been clearly stated on a number of occasions. I am sure that you understand what our policy is. In case there is any doubt of it, I am enclosing a copy of the recent bulletin issued on the subject which reviews in detail REA policy in this regard.

REA seeks to encourage its borrowers to secure power from existing wholesale suppliers where this power is available at as low a rate as it can be secured through other arrangements and where it is available on fair and reasonable terms. To this end we encourage our borrowers to negotiate fully with existing suppliers. The record shows that the three cooperatives to be served by Big Rivers RECC and Big Rivers RECC itself have attempted to negotiate a more favorable contract with your company over an extended period of time. The company chose to stand by its offer of schedule 61 as recently as last March and there was no indication on the part of Mr. Skinner and Mr. Blanton when they called on me in June that the company had changed its position on the matter of rates. Louisville Gas & Electric Co. also declined to make any contract modification, other than an offer to purchase the cooperative's system.

I see no useful purpose in the interest of the rural electrification program or the Government in holding a hearing on this application or any similar application for generation and transmission loan funds. These loans are made only if they meet our published criteria, and REA is fully accountable to the Congress and the public for the loans it makes. Furthermore, in this particular instance, as you know, there will be a full public hearing, not on the REA loan, but on the public interest considerations of the State of Kentucky before the Public Service Commission of Kentucky. I am sure that Kentucky Utilities will have full opportunity to present its position on this project at that time.

We do encourage our borrowers to negotiate with existing power suppliers; but if these negotiations are to be in good faith and are to be fruitful, they must be carried on between the borrower and the power suppliers involved before our borrowers have been forced to the expense and effort necessary to perfect a successful application for an REA generating and transmission loan. Kentucky Utilities had full opportunity to do this. It was certainly aware of the intention of the cooperatives to attempt to work out other means of power supply in the event their negotiations with Kentucky Utilities were unsuccessful.

I regret that it was necessary for the cooperatives to seek their own generation and transmission facilities to meet their power supply needs on the most advantageous basis possible, but it was the insistence of Kentucky Utilities on rates and terms which the cooperatives found were not the most advantageous that prompted their application for a loan.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN N. CLAPP,
Administrator.

Frank Boykin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, one of the most touching letters I have ever read was one written to Congressman FRANK BOYKIN by his daughter-in-law, affectionately known as Beppie Boykin. This letter was written shortly after Mr. Boykin's tragic defeat in Alabama. It bears no date but its composition was sometime contemporaneous with the recent statewide primary in Alabama. FRANK BOYKIN has a big heart. As long as he lives, he will go through life trying to help everybody. His type of enigma only comes once in a lifetime.

This was written by one of the many broken hearts which resulted from the defeat of my friend, FRANK BOYKIN.

MCINTOSH, ALA.,

May 30, 1962.

DEAREST PAPA: Ever since that day so long ago in 1945 when you put your arm around me in affection, and took me to the train in Washington when Dick and I had just gotten married, I've loved you and been proud of you. You have been kind, sweet, and generous to me—and to everybody. But that's not why I've loved you.

Since 8 or 10 years ago, I recognized in your inherent being, something truly different and apart from other people. Not your wonderful laughter, flamboyant speech or distinguished appearance—but something intangible—disparate from public acclaim, money or anything mundane. I realized you truly were seeking to do your Father's business.

Since that time, I've never known you to intentionally degrade or vilify another person. I've never known you to hold a grudge for the contradictions in a person's nature which inclined them to want to hurt you. I've never known any person who could carry suffering like a badge of honor. You did. I've never known any person who truly lived and thought "do unto others as you would have them do unto you." You do.

I've never known a person of whom I have thought, "Here is a man, called of God, to set the example of the strong to the weak." You are such a man. Life is so full of sorrow, and joy, disappointment and pain. Most of us are so weak. Without a captain to follow, we are lost on the black ocean of defeat. But, you. You are different.

Your sorrows and joys have all been worn with the courage of Him who knew sorrow and defeat before you. So is it really defeat? No, dear, dear Papa. You have won the greatest victory man ever won, that of finding the invisible road of doing what is right and honorable, and the most important thing about this is, you did it alone and by yourself, that in itself far surpasses any accolade you may receive, ever, for there will be many more for a man such as you would never go unnoticed.

And in your congressional defeat your attitude will make many weak men stronger for having observed victory in yourself.

I am more proud of you today than I was 2 weeks ago because I know your forgiving heart will make tough men ashamed, hard hearts softer and proud friends more proud.

Now you can be free of all the leeches who wanted too much without giving one

thing. You can spread your wonderful sunshine without shackles any more, so do it and never look back. You have too many guardian angels looking after you, so I know life will now in some measure repay you for all the great and wonderful things you have done.

Just feel sorry for the little people, with little hearts and minds who will wander erratically through life and never know any good thoughts or good rewards.

I love you,

BEPPIE BOYKIN.

Cuban Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include a letter from Mrs. Harold Chait, president, Baltimore Woman's Committee for Cuban Freedom, together with a statement of the program of this group and articles from the press covering this subject:

BALTIMORE WOMAN'S COMMITTEE
FOR CUBAN FREEDOM,
Baltimore, Md., October 3, 1962.

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON,
U.S. House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FALLON: On February 20, 1962, you inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at the request of the Baltimore Woman's Committee for Cuban Freedom, an article by the Baltimore Evening Sun, titled "Freedom Fighters: Frederick Cleric Enlists in Anti-Castro Movement," which was about our honorary chaplain, Rev. Father Joseph F. Thorning. Because of your magnificent cooperation in doing this for us we now are writing for you to consider inserting the enclosed three articles, about our "philosophy of freedom" program for the Cuban children. I also enclose the article I wrote and turned over to the press. It would be interesting to insert my original copy too.

We feel that our program merits public support. An insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would help tremendously.

If it is possible, when you finish with the enclosed clippings please return them to me. Thank you very much for your courtesy and consideration in this request.

Sincerely yours,

PHYLLIS CHAIT, President.

COPY SUBMITTED TO BALTIMORE EVENING SUN
(By Baltimore Woman's Committee for Cuban Freedom)

A "philosophy of freedom" program for Cuban refugee children has been launched here, by the Baltimore Woman's Committee for Cuban Freedom. The program, according to Committee President Mrs. Harold B. Chait is to educate the refugee children in the value and principles of democracy.

"What is happening to Cuban children is the real tragedy of Castro's Cuba," Mrs. Chait said. "The Communists are indoctrinating Cuban children from the age of 3 up. More than a million young people are being systematically brainwashed. We feel we must do something to rescue at least a few members of that lost generation."

The committee is offering classes for the study of the democratic heritage of both the

A7680

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

October 13

United States and Cuba. Mrs. Manuel Alpendre, committee secretary, a former kindergarten teacher, is instructing refugee children in the lives and philosophies of Washington, Lincoln, and Cuba's Jose Marti.

"We are taking field trips to nearby national monuments and historic sites," Mrs. Chait said. "We want the children to visit Mount Vernon, Lincoln's Tomb, Fort McHenry, and other symbols of freedom. Last week we visited Annapolis and were greeted by Gov. J. Millard Tawes."

Mrs. Chait said a number of refugee children had offered to contribute pennies to a fund for restoring the American Eagle which was atop the Maine Monument in Havana. The Eagle was topped by order of the Castro regime and replaced by a Soviet "peace" dove.

"It was a very touching gesture," Mrs. Chait said, "but we felt that perhaps it would be better if the children understood the true meaning of such monuments."

"It's not our purpose to indoctrinate them in American history," Mrs. Chait continued. "Nor is this a sort of Americanization program. We want the children to understand the universal principles of human freedom and the fallacies of communism. We also want these children to understand what has happened to them—some of the younger ones aren't sure why they are here. And we want them to know what is going on in their homeland right now."

"The Cuban Communists have launched a massive campaign to capture the country's youth. Thousands of children are being shipped to Russia for indoctrination. Communist teachers indoctrinate hundred of thousands of others in state schools. One estimate is that well over 100,000 Cuban youths are now fanatic Communists."

"Our program is only a small part of an operation to rescue and preserve for democracy at least a few of those children. Nearly 80,000 have already left Cuba and more arrive in the U.S. every day. Parents unable to leave put their children on outbound planes with nothing more than a frantic note appealing for help pinned to the child's shirt or blouse. Every night brave men risk their lives slipping into Cuba in small boats to ferry a few more children to freedom."

"We are determined that bravery and trust shall not be betrayed."

[Article as it appeared in the Baltimore Sun]
CUBAN CHILDREN TRAINING SET

A "philosophy of freedom" program for Cuban refugee children is being launched by the Baltimore Woman's Committee for Cuban Freedom.

The committee plans to offer classes for the study of the Democratic heritage of both the United States and Cuba. It is also planning field trips to nearby national monuments and historic sites.

Mrs. Harold B. Chait, committee president, said the program was not an attempt to indoctrinate the children in American history.

"Nor is this a sort of Americanization program," she said, "We want the children to understand the universal principles of human freedom and the fallacies of communism. We also want those children to understand what has happened to them—some of the younger ones aren't sure why they are here."

AFFAIRS IN HOMELAND

"And we want them to know what is going on in their homeland right now."

The committee president said the children would be instructed in the lives and philosophies of Washington, Lincoln, and Cuba's Jose Marti. She said the teacher would be Mrs. Marta Alpendre, committee secretary, and a former kindergarten teacher.

"Our program," she said, "is only a small part of an operation to rescue and preserve for democracy at least a few of those chil-

dren. Nearly 30,000 have already left Cuba and more arrive in the United States every day."

FRANTIC PLEAS FOR HELP

"Parents unable to leave put their children on outbound planes with nothing more than a frantic note appealing for help pinned to the child's shirt or blouse."

"Every night brave men risk their lives slipping into Cuba in small boats to ferry a few more children to freedom."

"We are determined that bravery and trust shall not be betrayed."

[From the Miami News, Aug. 21, 1962]

CUBAN FREEDOM EDUCATION

(By Hal Hendrix)

A dedicated group of American and Cuban (refugee) women in Baltimore, where a number of Cuban exiles are settled, are engaged in a program that merits expansion into all other areas sheltering those who have fled from Fidel Castro's Communist dictatorship.

Functioning as a nonpolitical and self-sustaining Baltimore Woman's Committee for Cuban Freedom, the group launched a philosophy-of-freedom program designed to educate Cuban refugee children in the values and principles of democracy.

As a supplement to their regular courses of education in public and private schools in the Baltimore area, the women are offering extracurricular classes for the study of the democratic heritage of both Cuba and the United States to Cuban children who have come with and without their parents from Communist Cuba.

Among other things, the Cuban children will learn of the lives and philosophies of Washington, Lincoln, and Cuba's Marti. To add interest to the instruction field trips will be made to nearby national monuments and historic sites that have become symbols of freedom.

Heading the program currently is an American, Mrs. Harold B. Chait. Working with her are several other U.S. citizens and Cuban women, including some teachers.

"It is not our purpose to indoctrinate the Cuban children in American history," emphasized Mrs. Chait. "Nor is this any sort of an Americanization program."

"We want the children to understand the principles of human freedom and the fallacies of communism. We also want them to understand what has happened to them. Some of the younger ones aren't sure why they are here. We want them to know also what is going on in their homeland right now—in terms that their young minds can understand."

Basically, the women's committee points out, the Baltimore program is an antidote.

"What is happening to Cuban children still in Cuba is the real tragedy of Castro's Communist regime," Mrs. Chait says. "The Communists there are indoctrinating Cuban children from the age of 3 years. More than a million young people are being systematically brainwashed. We must do something to rescue at least a few members of this lost generation."

There is no fiction in what the Baltimore group says about children in Cuba today, who might well turn out to be a major problem in tomorrow's Cuba. Thousands of Cuban youth have already been sent to Russia for training and education and Cuban schools are dominated by the Reds. They are working on Cuban minds in their most impressionable years.

Why wouldn't a program similar to Baltimore's be good for Miami?

[From the Baltimore News-Post, Sept. 21, 1962]

YOUNG CUBAN EXILES TOLD ABOUT DEMOCRACY

The most discouraging aspect of any battle—of ideologies is the warping of young minds.

Since the Red takeover in Cuba, Communists have been systematically brainwashing more than a million Cuban children from the ages of 3 and up.

Under sponsorship of the Baltimore Woman's Committee for Cuban Freedom, many of these children who have come to the United States are being told the American side of the story.

Yet, the purpose of this "Philosophy of Freedom" program is not to indoctrinate the refugee children in American history. What is being taught are universal principles of human freedom.

In Baltimore under the tutelage of Mrs. Manuel Alpendre, committee secretary and former kindergarten teacher, the children are learning about the lives and philosophies of Washington, Lincoln, and Cuba's Jose Marti.

In particular, the program emphasizes democratic heritages of both the United States and Cuba.

The children are taken on tours to such monuments to freedom as Fort McHenry, Lincoln's Tomb, and others.

Recently some of the children visited Governor Tawes in Annapolis and heard him describe events during the signing of the 1784 peace treaty at Annapolis, which ended the Revolutionary War.

The program is only a part of a national campaign designed to take care of the mounting influx of children being brought to this country from Cuba.

In Defense of Foreign Aid Cuts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, that the general public is becoming increasingly alarmed at certain facets of our foreign aid program is substantiated by personal contacts and letters I receive.

The following editorial appeared in a recent issue of the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer. It raises questions many of us have raised without answer by those who support bigger and bigger handouts.

FOREIGN AID BLACKMAILERS

Substantial cuts being made by Congress in foreign aid requests of the Kennedy administration are a natural and understandable reaction of resentment against the two-bit chiselers in some countries abroad who are trying to make a fool of Uncle Sam.

We in America are a patient and generous people but some foreign heads of government are going too far in accepting our aid dollars with one hand while giving us a sharp slap in the face with the other.

When these unprincipled doubledealers blazily embrace leaders of communism while simultaneously reaching into U.S. pockets for more dough, it's time to blow the whistle and call a halt.

Some of these phonies have been playing their crooked game for a long time. Tito of Yugoslavia and Nasser of Egypt are among the worst. India's Nehru isn't quite in the same class, perhaps, but the line he's walking between East and West is getting very thin.

Sukarno of Indonesia is one of the smoothest of the lot. He comes over periodically to persuade us to raise the foreign aid ante. Then he goes home to make big friendship scenes with Moscow

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

22239

to why this redemption of prisoners or ransom of prisoners is considered to be a charitable activity, the Secretary said, and I read again:

Throughout history the redemption of prisoners has been regarded as a charitable activity.

And I will include the entire incredible letter at the end of my remarks.

Let us bring this thing in focus. That leads to the conclusion of providing \$62 million to Fidel Castro whom the President himself called the enemy of the United States, by invoking the Trading with the Enemy Act effective February 7, 1962, which the President did to cut off the importation of Havana cigars coming in even through third friendly countries like Canada or the Canary Islands. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 5847, April 11, 1962. The President by invoking the Trading with the Enemy Act through Presidential proclamation declared Fidel Castro, and properly so, as an enemy of free nations of the world and the United States in particular. Yet, with this Treasury ruling, we find the typical inconsistent position of the New Frontier—talk tough and use a powder puff—we find the New Frontier at this time permitting the collection of \$62 million that is going to be used for what purpose? I am just as sympathetic to the prisoners as anybody else. I realize and so does everyone in the world how they got there. It was because they were not given the air coverage at the Bay of Pigs that they were entitled to and promised. But I want to free all the people in Cuba. I want to see the 6 million people who live in Cuba free. They are all prisoners of communism and Castro. If we free 1,113 who are now in prison, is Castro going to make another demand on the other 100,000 Cubans in prison in Cuba? If we set this precedent, what are we faced with in the future, the great powerful freedom-loving United States of America? We are faced with a precedent of paying money in ransom for prisoners. To whom? To the enemy. Of paying indemnity to the enemy.

I thought our historical answer to such demands has been—"Millions for defense—not one cent for tribute."

That should be our answer today.

What is going to be the result? What is Fidel Castro going to do with this money? That is the point. What is the Cuban Government, the Communists, going to do with this money, and drugs, and foodstuffs?

Fidel Castro is going to use them to keep himself and the Communists and the many Russian technicians, and Red Chinese in Cuba, to keep them in power and continue to subject the 6 million citizens of Cuba to virtual slavery. That is what we are contributing to.

That is why I am opposed to this abortive proposal and have been from its inception with the April 17 failure of the invasion of 1961. If you recall, I introduced a resolution opposing the tractors deal just a few weeks after it was made. So we have to keep our minds on what is going to happen by giving this ransom aid. It is going to permit Fidel

Castro to stay in power, to permit the Communists to stay in power and to subjugate the 6 million people in Cuba, and at the same time challenge the freedoms of the rest of the Western Hemisphere, challenge it by exporting Communists to other countries of the hemisphere—even with arms.

I say this is wrong. And the gentleman from Illinois the other day said critically that I should be the general to lead the invasion forces. I would suggest that the gentleman from Illinois aid me, follow me, rather than criticize me—not necessarily as a general leading the invasion with words, as he said, but I am at least not guilty of being silent in opposing this abortive proposal that is against everything that we stand for, the dignity of America, the freedom of the hemisphere, and a strong position in opposition to atheistic communism.

Look where we are today. What position are we in? We find that Mr. Donovan, who just happens to be a candidate for the U.S. Senate in New York, we find he was designated many months ago to do this negotiating. He obviously was given permission to do so.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I will yield after I have finished.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman is making a fine statement. It should be taken seriously. What concerns me is that the administration is still making Berlin its first and only challenge by the Communists and fails to watch out for Cuba, and the direct threat of the large military build-up to the United States, the American people, and the free world. Possibly Berlin is a diversion, with only small forces involved at present, but a two-headed thrust, when Cuba is carefully considered. I cannot understand why the administration thinks a military base in Cuba, could be "defensive." Why?

I believe that Cuba is equal to the challenge of communism that Berlin is. I know this from firsthand personal observation within the past 2 weeks.

On September 29 and 30, 1962, I went to the U.S. Guantanamo Naval Base in Cuba and was there for several days working hard to get firsthand information for our U.S. security. It was a serious trip. We were flown into Guantanamo escorted by two U.S. fighter jets, and we were flown out escorted by two U.S. fighter jets. That shows it is serious business.

When I was there I was shocked to find that there are 3,200 Cuban employees employed at the Guantanamo Naval Base in Cuba, and 2,400 of them go home in the Cuban territory in Oriente Province every evening. These are the people that run the shipyard, and include craftsmen, metalworkers, welders, drillers, carpenters, every kind of a trade that we have in oversupply in the United States. These are the workers in this greatest U.S. naval base and shipyard. Why not American workmen?

I am from the city of Pittsburgh, and we have a tremendous number of un-

employed in heavy industry trained in this type of work, yet we cannot get the administration people to employ these people at the Guantanamo Naval Base in Cuba.

Why this discrimination against American citizens, trained U.S. workers, and U.S. jobless veterans?

Castro's government in Cuba could shut our naval base down overnight by blocking the entry of these workers and diverting them as a ready made task force to the new Soviet-financed base now building near Havana. Guantanamo is the largest U.S. Navy base we have any place in the world, and ship basic repairs for the whole U.S. Atlantic Fleet are made here. Castro could shut Guantanamo down overnight simply by preventing the 2,400 employees from going in on any particular morning.

Another trouble is this: Because of this Cuban payroll, between \$6 and \$8 million in U.S. cash is going into Castro's coffers to keep Communism going in Cuba. That is being supported and paid for by U.S. taxpayers through payments made to these Cuban employees.

One of the tragedies of the Cuban situation is that at Guantanamo Bay we have only 1,500 military servicemen stationed there. Navy ships come and go, but they are not shore based. There are 3,200 Cuban employees who are able to take the U.S. Guantanamo base over at any given moment, many of them just as well physically built and equipment trained as any of the U.S. servicemen we have there.

Another problem that struck me very seriously is the neglect of this administration in not having the planes parked on the base runways protected at any time. There are no embankments or concrete revetments. Those planes are there just awaiting another Pearl Harbor. We need action for defense at Guantanamo and the base needs construction quick to modernize all installations. I am sure base personnel will heartily concur if asked.

Just 3 miles out of the base on one side, beyond Suicide Ridge, on one of the high hills beyond the Guantanamo Naval Base is a gun emplacement with large guns aimed right down into the naval base of the United States. In the other direction, about 5 miles away, there is another small mountain or high hill with more guns and artillery aiming down into the U.S. naval base. What are we doing about this?

At the base, we are yet unable to supply our own water, and have to depend on an outside Cuban water company. The source of supply is 4 or 5 miles outside the U.S. naval base. We have only a pipe coming out of there. There is no guard by the United States either on the reservoir or on the water system in the Cuban area. There is just one pipe, so that could be shut off at any time. We need salt water conversion equipment, and quick.

The administration should make clear we are putting standby carriers down there with an adequate reserve supply of water in case of a long siege, if necessary.

When I was there I learned about what was happening on the materials being shipped into Cuba at present.

The amount, description, and size of shipments is shocking.

Mr. Speaker, the point that struck me so forcefully was the rate of shipping going into Cuban ports. These ships consisted of large-mast ships of new design, laden part way up the mast in many instances, and on other occasions you could see from photographs that they had gun mounts, plane parts, missile-carrying PT boats on the decks.

Mr. Speaker, these ships are not going in one or two at a time. For the week ending September 29, when I was there, there were over 200 ships which went into Cuban ports under full steam taking military and civilian supplies that Cuba so badly needs. That is at the rate of 10,000 ships a year going to Cuba, and over half of them are ships which come from our so-called friends and allies of the free world and the neutralist countries.

That means there are 100 ships a week from the Communist bloc countries going into Cuba carrying ammunition and military supplies, which even this administration admits is at the rate of millions of dollars a year.

To me this is a major destructive threat to the whole of the State of Florida and to every State in the eastern part of the United States, and is a destructive threat to the security of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that by only passing resolutions on Cuba and hitting with the powderpuff, and sending strong words to Khrushchev on Berlin, this administration is making a real mistake. We must be firm on Cuba.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman for his remarks, and I shall be glad to yield further when I have finished a few remarks that I have to make on this subject. Of course, the gentleman is eminently correct in many of his observations.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield further to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I have been advised that there are over 200 Mig planes now based in Cuba, and there has even been seen a Mig 21, their latest model. This is a tremendous threat to the United States, because with proper remodeling and change the Mig 19's and Mig 21's can carry 1,000-pound nuclear weapons which will endanger any American city up to about an 800-mile range. This is a real threat, in my opinion, and I think we need firm action on Cuba. The President should immediately meet with Prime Minister Khrushchev and make plain the U.S. position and our intended strong steps to protect ourselves, the Western Hemisphere, and the free world.

Mr. CRAMER. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks and his support of my position in bringing out some facts of tremendous importance. Of course, the gentleman's discussion of the buildup militarily in Cuba is the best evidence of the fact that we should not give to Castro

any American dollars which are being collected by this ransom committee, or any foodstuffs or any medicine that Castro can use to trade to Red China and Russia and certainly not any taxpayer-supported funds or foodstuffs. As we all know, they need foodstuffs and medicines and they certainly would like to have American dollars to help build up their war materiel, their big machine—that the administration admits has imported at least \$200 million worth of war materiel, making them the second military power in this hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, there is no excuse in the world for this, by direction, indirection, or regardless of the amount of compassion which we may have for the prisoners, and I have as much compassion as anyone else. I do not believe that we should help Castro stay in power. Castro admittedly, as all other Communist nations, have a serious food shortage, because the agrarian reforms which were pushed have not been successful, not only in Cuba, but anywhere in the Communist world. So, he needs foodstuffs badly. For what? To stay in power, to keep from losing control of Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, how humiliating a position do we find ourselves in with these negotiations? We find a gentleman by the name of Donovan, whom I say just happens to be a candidate for the U.S. Senate in New York, negotiating on behalf of whom? The prisoners' committee, supposedly. But, he could not be negotiating or he would be violating the Logan Act, unless he had "the authority of the United States" to do so. There is not any question about it. He must have the authority of the Government of the United States. He has been in and out of the Attorney General's office on a number of occasions. The State Department has conferred with him. I would venture to say that he is being conferred with right now in Miami, assuming he is still there, because the State Department has in Miami at this time a representative, Mr. James L. Greenfield, the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Information, Bureau of Public Affairs, who is at Homestead, Fla., now, and has been for some time.

He is in charge of what the administration calls mysteriously—this whole thing has been mysterious—Project X. Project X is the preparation for the importation of the prisoners and the co-operation of the State Department to bring it about. So there is no doubt but what this not only has the condonation but the full back of the administration and is contrary to the best interests of this country.

I have asked the question, Does not this administration have compassion for Americans who are in prison in Cuba? I provided for the Record this week a list of 10 Americans who are in prison. The New Frontier is letting American prisoners rot in prisons around the world, including 21 in Cuban jails, on trumped-up charges, while backing the Cuban prisoner ransom blackmail deal as indemnity to Communist Castro because of the abortive failure of the invasion at the Bay of Pigs.

I charge that some 21 prisoners are held in jail largely on bogus charges, and many of them are in ill health. They are being mistreated, many of them. They are underfed. But we hear little of efforts to get them out of prison, while every administration pressure that can be brought to bear is being used to get the release of the Cuban prisoners, including the making of the contributions to the Cuban Ransom Committee tax deductible, as I said before; sending Donovan to get on his knees in the name of the United States, to Castro, and influencing American pharmaceutical and food houses to make contributions to the Cuban Ransom Committee and even planning to put in U.S. funds if needed.

Compassion for Cuban prisoners? Si. Compassion for American prisoners? No. That seems to be the policy of the New Frontier apparently, because the whole philosophy of this blackmail deal that the administration is trying to sell to the American people is a deal that helps Castro and the Communists stay in power with medicines, foodstuffs, and drugs, and is to apologize for the invasion failure. Maybe this whole contribution program ought to be renamed. Maybe they ought to call it the Kennedy conscience fund, instead.

The State Department refuses to give me the names of the prisoners, the 21 prisoners in the Cuban jails; 4 being held against their will in Red China; 1 in Russia; 4 unaccounted for in North Korea. Where is our compassion for our own citizens who are being held by the Communists throughout the world, if ransom is to be the sorry, humiliating approach? It is obvious that ransom and indemnity have never been the approach of this great country in fighting for freedom.

Despite the refusal of the State Department to give me the names of the Cuban prisoners I have been able to acquire the names of 18 of them, and here they are as reported to me by the only source available to me: Raefael del Pino, of New York and Miami; Austin Young, of Miami; James Wellington King, of Miami; Donald Joe Green, of York, S.C.; Alfred E. Gibson, of Mount Gilbuss, N.C.; James G. Dean, of Franklinville, N.C.; Thomas Baker of Dothan, Ala.; Eustace Danbrent, of Baltimore, Md.; Daniel Carswell, of East Chester, N.Y.; and Edmond Taransky, of New York City.

Those names I published earlier in the week. These are the others: Miss Marilyn Menger, of Miami. I do not know where the rest of them are from, but here are the names: Dario Prohias Bello, Martha O'Neal, Robert John Gentile, Juana Pedro Koop, Peter Joe Lambton, Richard Allen Peconaro, Leonard L. Schmidt.

Where is our compassion for these American citizens rotting in Cuban jails? Our attitude about American prisoners seems to be that nothing can be done for them short of efforts to do exactly what we should do, not only for the Cuban prisoners, but to free all of Cuba from Castro and communism. But our attitude about Cuban prisoners is that we must give in to Castro's ransom and indemnity demands and provide him